



THE
AMERICAN BC!
CATHOLIC QUARTERLY
REVIEW

Under the Direction of

MOST REV. PATRICK JOHN RYAN, D. D.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS, RT. REV. MGR. J. F. LOUGHLIN, D. D., REV. JAMES P.
TURNER AND MR. JOHN J. O'SHEA.

Bonum est homini ut eum veritas vincat volentem, quia malum est homini ut eum veritas
vincat invitum. Nam ipsa vincat necesse est, sive negantem sive confitentem.

S. AUG. EPIST. ccxxxviii. AD PASCENT.

VOLUME XXVII.

FROM JANUARY TO OCTOBER, 1902.

BOSTON COLLEGE LIBRARY
CHESTNUT HILL, MASS.

PHILADELPHIA :

211 SOUTH SIXTH STREET.

Entered according to Act of Congress,
in the year 1901,
By P. J. RYAN,
In the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at
Washington, D. C.

70760

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	PAGE
Agnostic, The Last Words of an—Rev. S. Fitzsimons.....	649
Americanism, Native—H. J. Desmond.....	747
Anarchism—Charles P. Neill, Ph. D.....	160
Ancient Cathedrals of Scotland, The—Dom Michael Barrett, O. S. B.....	I, 313, 527
Apostolical Letter of His Holiness Pope Leo XIII.....	583
Attitude of the Jesuits in the Trials for Witchcraft—Rev. Robert Schwickerath, S. J.....	475
Austrian Explorations in Lycia—Donat Sampson.....	277
Barrett, O. S. B., Dom Michael—The Ancient Cathedrals of Scotland.....	I, 313, 527
Beginnings of Christianity, The—Rev. Thomas J. Shahan, D. D.....	431
Bunyan, St. Ignatius and John—Rev. Joseph Rickaby, S. J.....	294
California, Spanish Friars in—Bryan J. Clinch.....	760
Campbell, D. D., Right Rev. Mgr. James A.—Christianity and Paganism in Rome During the Transition Period.....	97
Cashel and Its Late Archbishop, The See of—John J. O'Shea....	721
Cathedrals of Scotland, The Ancient—Dom Michael Barrett, O. S. B.....	I, 313, 527
Catholic France Prior to the French Revolution—Richard R. Elliott	119
Caucasus by Russia, The Conquest of the—Donat Sampson....	682
Chinese Crisis, Origin and Causes of the—Rev. J. Freri, D. C. L.....	228
Christianity, The Beginnings of—Rev. Thomas J. Shahan, D. D.....	431
Christianity and Paganism in Rome During the Transition Period—Right Rev. Mgr. James A. Campbell, D. D.....	97
Church, A Study in the Flora of Holy—A. E. P. R. Dowling, B. A.....	453
Clinch, Bryan J.—Missionary Ideals, Christian and Commercial.....	78
Clinch, Bryan J.—Spanish Friars in California.....	760
Clinch, Bryan J.—The New Language Despotism in the Phil- ippines	369
Columbanus at Luxeuil, St.—Rev. Thomas J. Shahan, D. D....	54
Commencements of the Normans, The—Rev. Reuben Par- sons, D. D.....	32
Conquest of the Caucasus by Russia, The—Donat Sampson....	682
Dante's Conception of the Beatific Vision—Rev. Francis de Capitain	417

	PAGE
De Capitain, Rev. Francis—Dante's Conception of the Beatific Vision	417
Desmond, H. J.—Native Americanism.....	747
Determinism versus Free-Will—Rev. John J. Ming, S. J.....	252
Dowling, B. A., A. E. P. R.—A Study in the Flora of Holy Church	453
Dwight, M. D., Ph. D., Thomas—The Trials and Needs of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul.....	140
Education, History of—Rev. W. Poland, S. J.....	145
Education by the State—L. J. Markoe.....	782
Elliott, Richard R.—Catholic France Prior to the French Revolution	119
Encyclical, De Sanctissima Eucharistia.....	625
England's Reformation, The True Authors of—Very Rev. William Fleming, D. D.....	239
Fitzsimons, Rev. S.—The Last Words of an Agnostic.....	649
Fleming, D. D., Very Rev. William—The True Authors of England's Reformation.....	239
France and the Religious Orders—F. W. Parsons.....	209
France Prior to the French Revolution, Catholic—Richard R. Elliott	119
Free-Will, Determinism versus—Rev. John J. Ming, S. J.....	252
Freri, D. C. L., Rev. J.—Origin and Causes of the Chinese Crisis	228
Friars in California, Spanish—Bryan J. Clinch.....	760
Ganss, Rev. H. G.—The Jesuits and Tyrannicide.....	334
Goodier, S. J., Rev. A.—Thomas Henry Huxley.....	21
History of Education—Rev. W. Poland, S. J.....	145
Huxley, Thomas Henry—Rev. A. Goodier, S. J.....	21
Ireland's Downfall, The Relations of Economic Theories to—John J. O'Shea.....	352
Jesuits and Tyrannicide, The—Rev. H. G. Ganss.....	334
Jesuits at Court—J. M. Stone.....	704
Jesuits in the Trials for Witchcraft, Attitude of the—Rev. Robert Schwickerath, S. J.....	475
Kent, O. S. C., Rev. W. H.—Leibnitz and the Nineteenth Century	516

	PAGE
Last Mexican Empire, The—Wilfrid C. Robinson, F. R. Hist. S.	541
Last Words of an Agnostic, The—Rev. S. Fitzsimons.....	649
Leibnitz and the Nineteenth Century—Rev. W. H. Kent, O. S. C.....	516
Lettre Apostolique de Sa Saintete le Pape Leon XIII.....	563
Luxeuil, St. Columbanus at—Rev. Thomas J. Shahan, D. D....	54
Lycia, Austrian Explorations in—Donat Sampson.....	277
Markoe, L. J.—Education by the State.....	782
Mexican Empire, The Last—Wilfrid C. Robinson, F. R. Hist. S.	541
Ming, S. J., Rev. John J.—Determinism versus Free-Will....	252
Missionary Ideals, Christian and Commercial—Bryan J. Clinch.	78
Native Americanism—H. J. Desmond.....	747
Neill, Ph. D., Charles P.—Anarchism.....	160
New Language Despotism in the Philippines, The—Bryan J. Clinch	369
Normans, The Commencements of the—Rev. Reuben Parsons, D. D.....	32
Origin and Causes of the Chinese Crisis—Rev. J. Freri, D. C. L.	228
O'Shea, John J.—The Relations of Economic Theories to Ire- land's Downfall.....	352
O'Shea, John J.—The See of Cashel and Its Late Archbishop...	721
O'Sullivan, S. J., Rev. D. T.—Scientific Chronicle. 180, 389, 602, 813	
Paganism in Rome During the Transition Period, Christianity and—Right Rev. Mgr. James A. Campbell, D. D.....	97
Parsons, F. W.—France and the Religious Orders.....	209
Parsons, D. D., Rev. Reuben—The Commencements of the Nor- mans	32
Philippines, The New Language Despotism in the—Bryan J. Clinch	369
Poland, S. J., Rev. W.—History of Education.....	145
Pre-Hellenic Writing in the Ægean—Rev. Daniel Quinn.....	667
Quinn, Rev. Daniel—Pre-Hellenic Writing in the Ægean.....	667
Reformation, The True Authors of England's—Very Rev. Will- iam Fleming, D. D.....	239
Relations of Economic Theories to Ireland's Downfall, The— John J. O'Shea.....	352
Rickaby, S. J., Rev. Joseph—St. Ignatius and John Bunyan....	294
Robinson, F. R. Hist, S., Wilfrid C.—The Last Mexican Em- pire	541

	PAGE
Rome During the Transition Period, Christianity and Paganism in—Right Rev. Mgr. James A. Campbell, D. D.	97
Russia, The Conquest of the Caucasus by—Donat Sampson.	682
St. Columbanus at Luxeuil—Rev. Thomas J. Shahan, D. D.	54
St. Ignatius and John Bunyan—Rev. Joseph Rickaby, S. J.	294
Sampson, Donat—Austrian Explorations in Lycia.	277
Sampson, Donat—The Conquest of the Caucasus by Russia.	682
Schwickerath, S. J., Rev. Robert—Attitude of the Jesuits in the Trials for Witchcraft.	475
Scientific Chronicle—Rev. D. T. O'Sullivan, S. J. . 180, 389, 602, 813	
Scotland, The Ancient Cathedrals of—Dom Michael Barrett, O. S. B.	I, 313, 527
See of Cashel and Its Late Archbishop, The—John J. O'Shea. .	721
Shahan, D. D., Rev. Thomas J.—St. Columbanus at Luxeuil.	54
Shahan, D. D., Rev. Thomas J.—The Beginnings of Christianity. .	431
Spanish Friars in California—Bryan J. Clinch.	760
Stone, J. M.—Jesuits at Court.	704
Study in the Flora of Holy Church, A—A. E. P. R. Dowling, B. A.	453
Trials and Needs of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul, The— Thomas Dwight, M. M., Ph. D.	140
True Authors of England's Reformation, The—Very Rev. Will- iam Fleming, D. D.	239
Tyrannicide, The Jesuits and—Rev. H. G. Ganss.	334
Witchcraft, Attitude of the Jesuits in the Trials for—Rev. Rob- ert Schwickerath, S. J.	475

BOOKS REVIEWED.

Adoration of the Blessed Sacrament, The—Tesnière.	412
Appleton's Universal Cyclopædia and Atlas.	614
Casus Conscientiæ—Genicot.	416
Casus Conscientiæ—Lehmkuhl.	832
Catholic Church from Within, The.	204
Catholic Stories.	415

	PAGE
Church Building—Cram.....	202
Concilium Tridentinum.....	192
Die Wirkungen des Bussakrament—Buchberger.....	832
Divine Plan of the Church, The—MacLaughlin.....	205
Dolphin, The.....	618
Einleitung in das Neue Testament—Belser.....	839
Faith of the Millions, The—Tyrrell.....	196
Fenelon—Sanders	402
First Religious Instruction—Fuhlrott.....	827
Geschichte der Altkirchlichen Litteratur—Bardenhewer.....	829
History of England—Powell and Tout.....	406
Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, The—Gihl.....	828
Instructions on Preaching—Boyle.....	830
Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents, The.....	410
Jesus Living in the Priest—Millet.....	399
Joan of Arc—de Julleville.....	203
Kinthead's Baltimore Series of Catechisms.....	413
Life of Bartolomé de Las Casas, The—Dutto.....	414
Life of Jesus Christ—Elliott.....	622
Lincoln's Plan of Reconstruction—McCarthy.....	407
Lives of the Popes in the Early Middle Ages—Mann.....	823
Luke Delmege—Sheehan.....	195
Madame Rosély—Monniot.....	412
Manual of Ascetical Theology, A—Devine.....	404
Novum Testamentum.....	832
"Orate Fratres"—Gaudentius.....	416
Practical Commentary on Holy Scripture, A—Knecht.....	415
Practical Preaching for Priests and People—Holland.....	201
Pre-Columbian Discovery of America by the Northmen, The— Da Costa.....	199
Poems, Charades, Inscriptions of Pope Leo XIII.—Henry.....	623
Renaissance Types—Lilly.....	200

	PAGE
Revolution in the Science of Cosmology, A—Campbell.....	824
Rise and Development of Christian Architecture, The—Ayer...	831
Roads to Rome.....	198
Saint of the Oratory, A—Kerr.....	205
Sermons for the Sundays—Vianney.....	827
Sermons on the Stations of the Cross—Raycroft.....	827
Short Sermons for Low Masses—Heffner.....	827
Special Introduction to the Study of the Old Testament—Gigot.	207
Stormy Life, A—Fullerton.....	207
Theologia Moralis—Sporer.....	206
Treasure of the Church, The—Bagshawe.....	826
Triumph of the Cross, The—Fra Girolamo Savonarola.....	409
Universal History—Parsons.....	620

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW

"Contributors to the QUARTERLY will be allowed all proper freedom in the expression of their thoughts outside the domain of defined doctrines, the REVIEW not holding itself responsible for the individual opinions of its contributors."

(Extract from Salutory, July, 1890.)

VOL. XXVII.—JANUARY, 1902—No. 105.

THE ANCIENT CATHEDRALS OF SCOTLAND.

PART I.

THE contrast, apparent at the present day, between the condition of the Scottish Cathedrals and those of England illustrates the difference in the spirit which animated the leaders of the Reformation in the two kingdoms. England retained episcopacy and the ancient buildings connected with it; for Henry VIII., though he broke loose from Rome, changed no doctrine except that of the Pope's supremacy, and those who completed his work, amid much havoc of tenets and practices, left some outward semblance of the old order. Scotland, on the other hand, became rigidly Presbyterian, and rejected everything pertaining to prelacy, ceremonial or beauty of surroundings in public worship. Hence it has come to pass that while in the southern kingdom the ancient buildings still stand in much of their original beauty—silent witnesses indeed to the faith for which they were reared—in Scotland it is far otherwise. Out of the thirteen Cathedrals which were once the glory of Scottish Catholics, only one remains in its entirety; as to the others, where puritanical fury has not utterly destroyed them, considerable portions, at least, have perished through persistent neglect and the ravages of time. Yet even in their ruins they give evidence of the

beauty and glory which once were theirs, while the noteworthy facts of history which cling to their desecrated ruins render them still more attractive to the Catholic student of antiquity.

It is not the purport of these pages to give a complete history of each of these ancient landmarks; as to some of them it would be impossible, for both buildings and records have all but entirely vanished. Still something can be gleaned about all, and much about some of them to make (as the writer hopes) some sufficiently interesting papers. The fragments of their buildings still remaining, the patient research of antiquaries and the testimony of historical documents enable us to reconstruct to some extent the old Scottish Cathedrals and to tell something of their story, and that is all that will be attempted here.

The first in importance, because of its connection with the primatial see, was the Cathedral of St. Andrews, in Fifeshire.¹ The ecclesiastical supremacy of the see as well as its name rested on the presence there of considerable relics of St. Andrew the Apostle, who became recognized in succeeding ages as the primary patron of the whole country. Much that was long cherished with regard to the history of these relics is now regarded as legendary. The labors of critical enquirers have brought about the discarding of long accepted traditions as contradictory to historical facts and fixed dates, yet the possession of such relics by the city has never been denied. The early legends relate that a certain Abbot Regulus, or Rule, who lived in the fourth century, when engaged in his duties as custodian of the shrine of the Apostle at Patras in Achaia, received a divine command to convey certain of the relics to a country "towards the ends of the earth," and having set sail with them, in company with many fellow-voyagers, was wrecked at the spot where St. Andrews now stands and where the King, Ungus, built a church for the sacred treasure. That a St. Rule lived at St. Andrews is undoubted; a cave by the seashore bears his name and the earlier church was dedicated to him; but that he brought the relics there from the East at that early date is now called in question. Dr. Skene, the late Historiographer Royal, after a thorough discussion of the subject, inclines to the opinion that St. Rule was an Irish monk of the eighth century, and that the relics were brought to St. Andrews from the Cathedral of Hexham at about that date, but by another hand.²

With the early Bishops of St. Andrews it is unnecessary to concern ourselves here; the episcopate of Bishop Robert (1128-1159) introduces us to the commencement of the buildings whose remains

¹ To avoid the multiplication of foot notes it may be stated here that the authority chiefly relied upon by the writer with regard to this cathedral has been Rev. C. J. Lyon's "History of S. Andrews." ² For the entire treatment of the matter the reader is referred to Skene's "Celtic Scotland," Vol. II., p. 261-277.

are still extant. That prelate had formerly been Prior of the Austin Canons of Scone, and when raised to the Bishopric resolved to establish a community of those canons in connection with his Cathedral. To house them he made some commencement of the priory buildings and seems at the same time to have erected the tiny little Church of St. Rule³ in connection with the tall square tower, over 100 feet high, which, according to certain authorities, existed previous to his time. Some, indeed, have thought the whole building anterior to Bishop Robert.⁴ Though standing some hundred feet to the southeast of the later erection, St. Rule's may be regarded as belonging to the Cathedral group, and though earlier in date, has survived the other buildings by reason of the strength and solidity of its construction.

The commencement of the Cathedral proper was the work of Arnold, Robert's successor in the see. He had been Abbot of Kelso, one of the most ornate of the Benedictine houses, and was accustomed to the stately grandeur of that noble pile, so worthy of the sacred rites carried on therein with such solemn dignity. Instead of enlarging St. Rule's, Arnold began an entirely new structure towards the northwest of the old church. It took 160 years to complete this "new" or "great church," as it got to be called, and the works went on under eleven successive prelates. In most of the mediæval churches the building began at the east end, and the sanctuary and choir were the first portions to be completed, in order that the sacred rites might as soon as possible be celebrated. The remainder of the structure would be carried on by degrees towards the west end. It is to this gradual process that so many of the ancient churches owe the variety of style often to be seen in their component parts; each portion as it proceeded became stamped with the particular style which prevailed at the time or which was preferred by those who directed the works. Evidence of this is to be found in St. Andrews, as will be seen later.

The choir, at least, was finished before 1233; for Bishop Malvoisin, who died in that year, was laid at rest, as Wyntoun relates, "in the new Kyrk."⁵ Bishop William Wishart, in his episcopate of less than eight years, built the nave almost entirely, defraying the whole expense out of his revenues.⁶ He died in 1279. It was not until 1318 that the finished building was ready for consecration; in that year Bishop William de Lamberton solemnly dedicated the Cathedral in presence of King Robert Bruce, seven Bishops and fifteen abbots taking part in the function.⁷ The King on this occasion

³ Robertson, *Quarterly Review*, Vol. lxxxv., p. 120. ⁴ Lang, "St. Andrews," p. 34 (note). ⁵ "Orygynale Cronykil of Scotland," b. vii., c. ix. ⁶ *Ibid*, b. vii., c. x. ⁷ *Ibid*, b. viii., c. xxii.

endowed the new erection with a yearly revenue of a hundred marks in gratitude for the victory of Bannockburn.

Although the ascertained measurements make it at most some 385 feet in length and 62 in breadth, yet the most extraordinary statements have been made at various times as to the size of the church when completed. Lockhart, in his "Life of Scott," says: "I believe there is no doubt that the metropolitan Cathedral of St. Andrews had been the longest in Europe."⁸ He quotes as his authority the old Scottish writer Volusene, or Wilson. Another author goes more into detail; Slezer, in his "*Theatrum Scotiæ*," calls it the largest in Christendom and gives its dimensions as "seven feet longer and two feet broader than St. Peter's at Rome."⁹ The only explanation seems to be that both writers refer to the old St. Peter's; for Wilson lived in the sixteenth century before the present Vatican Basilica was completed, and Slezer settled in Scotland only forty years after its consecration in 1626. In any case the statement is inaccurate; for, although old St. Peter's is said to have measured 340 feet exclusive of the apse, its width was three times that of St. Andrews.¹⁰ Moreover, many of the English Cathedrals exceeded the Scottish metropolitan church in length. All that can be said with certainty in this matter is that St. Andrews had the largest Cathedral of Scotland.

Only sixty years after its dedication the Cathedral suffered severely from fire, which originated, it is said, from the carelessness of a plumber, who suffered some burning lead to fall into the dry twigs which composed the nest of a jackdaw. So serious was the damage that at least £18,000 (\$90,000), at present money value, were expended in repairs. Further benefactors enriched the building by windows, pavements and carving during the centuries which followed, until it merited by its beauty the proud title of the "Canterbury of the North."

Exteriorly the Cathedral seems to have been very imposing. Its warm red stone formed a pleasing contrast to St. Rule's gray walls and tower, hard by. Martine, writing more than a century after its destruction, but while the remains must have been more considerable than at present, speaks of "five pinnacles and a great steeple on the top of the church, . . . the chief steeple . . . erected a great deal larger and higher than any of the rest."¹¹ The entrance at the west end was through a fine "Galilee" porch, whose interior walls were richly arcaded; this was flanked exteriorly by a turret 110 feet high.¹² The arch which led to the church was known from its beauty as the "Golden Gate."¹³ A "Galilee" was not an uncom-

⁸ Vol. IX., p. 125 (note). ⁹ P. 38. ¹⁰ *Vide*, Barnes, "St. Peter in Rome," p. 254. ¹¹ Quoted by Lang, "St. Andrews," p. 55. ¹² Walcott, "Ancient Church of Scotland," p. 80. ¹³ *Ibid*.

mon feature in a conventual church. It seems to have derived its name from the angel's words to the holy women: "Behold, He will go before you into Galilee; there you shall see Him."¹⁴ The appropriateness of the title lay in the fact of the porch being the only recognized part of the church where women were permitted to converse with the religious who served it.¹⁵

A visitor entering by the western door would find himself in a nave of twelve bays and measuring 200 feet in length. Its arches were supported on unusually massive octagonal pillars and above them ran a triforium opening into the nave by smaller arches, and higher still another passage through the clerestory. At the eastern extremity of the nave was the rood-screen; beyond it, under the great tower supported by lofty arches on massive pillars, stretched to north and south extensive transepts, while towards the east was the choir, its roof resting on beautiful clustered pillars. Thus the ground-plan formed a Latin cross. From the eastern wall of the choir a lady chapel was built out and was entered by an arch behind the high altar canopy. The transepts had each an eastern aisle of the same width as the choir aisles and running at right angles with them. The effect of the forest of pillars must have been wonderfully beautiful. The style of the windows varied with the date of their erection. Those towards the western end were pointed; the earlier ones, semi-circular. In the south transept a flight of stone steps led to the dormitory of the canons, for convenience in celebrating the night office.

The interior decorations added to the charm of the building. Prior Bisset, superior of the monastery (1393-1416), enriched the choir with new stalls after the fire.¹⁶ Prior John de Haldenstane (1418-1443) placed the large window in the east gable and adorned the church with carved stalls and images of saints. The same generous donor supplied the beautiful windows and polished pavements of the nave, choir and transepts.

There were as many as thirty altars in the Cathedral; six of these stood in the transepts and two others at the eastern extremity on either side of the arch leading into the lady chapel. The altar of St. John the Baptist was founded by Archdeacon Inglis in 1494, with chaplain's stipend for a daily Mass; Andrew, Bishop of Moray, in like manner endowed the altar of St. Martin for the benefit of the souls of the Kings James I., James II., James III. and James IV., and of the Queens Joan, Mary and Margaret, wives of the first three. Other altars stood in various parts of the church. Among

¹⁴ S. Matt. xxviii., 7. ¹⁵ *Vide*, Walcott, "Church and Conventual Arrangements," p. 80. That author gives other derivations of the name in addition to the above. ¹⁶ Fordun, "Scotichronicon," lib. vi., c. 55.

their dedications were the Holy Cross, the Precious Blood, Our Lady of Pity, St. Michael, St. Peter, St. John, St. James, St. Bartholomew, St. Nicholas, St. Ninian, St. Antony, St. Lawrence, All Saints, St. Mary Magdalene, St. Anne, St. Catherine, St. Barbara and others. Many of these altars were also endowed in perpetuity. A statue of Our Lady was known as the "Douglas Virgin," probably because it had been given by that family. Archibald, Earl of Douglas, endowed it with two marks annually to maintain a light before it.¹⁷ It is sad to think that all such pious benefactions are now of no avail; no Masses are offered, no lights burn.

Many interesting historical memories are grouped around the Cathedral of St. Andrews. That was a red-letter day for the city when in presence of King Malcolm IV. Bishop Arnold laid the foundation stone—the most notable act of his short pontificate of four years (1159-1163). More glorious still was that on which Bishop Lamberton solemnly dedicated the church to God, some 160 years later. During the centuries that followed, its Bishops often took a prominent part in the affairs of the kingdom. Thus Hugh (1178) was the chaplain of King William the Lion, and was so special a favorite of that monarch that he obstinately refused to allow any other cleric to be placed in the see. Roger (1188) was ex-Chancellor of the kingdom; William Malvoisin (1202) both baptized and crowned King Alexander II.; David, Great Chamberlain to Alexander II., anointed Alexander III.; William Wishart (1272) had been Chancellor of the kingdom, and Alexander III. assisted at his consecration; William Fraser (1279) was both Chancellor and Regent of the kingdom; William Landells (1341) crowned Robert II.; James Kennedy, nephew of James I., was one of the Regents for James III.; James Stuart (1497) was son of James III.; Cardinal Beaton, its most famous Archbishop, the greatest figure in the history of the Scottish Reformation, was the special friend and councillor of James V. and the bulwark of Catholicity as long as he lived. It was a Bishop, Henry Wardlaw, who founded, in 1141, the University of St. Andrews, while Bishop Kennedy, in 1451, founded St. Salvador's College. Other prelates did much towards the improvement and beautifying of the Cathedral city. Thus Bishop Roger and Bishop Trail built the famous Castle of St. Andrews, which played so important a part in later ages, and Bishop Wardlaw was the donor of the guard bridge over the Eden.

The priors of St. Andrews ruled over the canons in the monastery and presided at the choir offices. They ranked before any of the abbots of the kingdom and occupied a seat in Parliament.¹⁸ Many of

¹⁷ *Vide*, Walcott, "Ancient Church of Scotland," p. 77. The writer gives original authorities for the information concerning altars. ¹⁸ Fordun, "Scotichronicon," lib. vi., c. xlix.

them were notable men. John de Haldenstane, already mentioned, obtained from Pope Martin I., for himself and his successors, the privilege of using the mitre, so that after his time the priors were able to celebrate pontifically in the absence of the Bishop. The Church offices were always carried out with much solemnity; for the Austin Canons were renowned for their devotional singing. Prior Hepburn founded St. Leonard's College and began, about the year 1520, the magnificent boundary wall round the precincts of the priory. This splendid piece of work was 870 yards in length and in some parts as much as 22 feet high. It was adorned with about sixteen turrets and with many statues and shields bearing coats-of-arms.

In 1537 St. Andrews was the centre of rejoicing, on the occasion of the marriage of James V. to Mary of Guise. The bride was lodged in the New Inn, the hospice of the priory, which had been specially fitted up for her at great cost. At the "new gate" a triumphal arch had been erected, and here took place one of the pageants so much in favor at that period. Sir David Lindsay, we are told, "caused a great cloud to come out of the heavens above the gate and open instantly, and there appeared a fair lady, most like an angel, having the keys of Scotland in her hands, and delivered them to the Queen, in sign and token that all the hearts of Scotland were open to receive Her Grace."¹⁹ The marriage was solemnized in the Cathedral by Archbishop James Beaton, and the celebrations lasted for forty days, "with great merriness and games, as jesting, running at the lists, archery, hunting, hawking, with singing and dancing in maskery and playing and all other princely game, according to a king and queen."²⁰ Only twenty years later St. Andrews witnessed far different scenes. Knox and his "rascal multitude" arrived in the city on June 9, 1559, and not only were the monasteries of the Dominicans and Franciscans overthrown by these violent "reformers," but, according to the generally received tradition, the glorious cathedral also was, at least partly, demolished. Whatever mutilated remnants may have escaped their fury were more completely wrecked by order of the Protestant leaders in the year following, when the Earls of Argyll, Arran and Glencairn roamed about the country destroying what they were pleased to style "monuments of idolatry." Later on the devastation was completed by the carting off in great quantities of the stones which had formed the building, for the purpose of constructing the pier of St. Andrews. All that can be seen now are portions of the west front, of the wall of the south aisle, of the south and west walls, of the transept and other scattered fragments. Even in their ruinous con-

¹⁹ Lindsay of Pitscottie, quoted by Lyon, "History of S. Andrews," Vol. II., p. 273. ²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 274.

dition they form an imposing group. It is but just to say that they are now duly cared for and protected from further molestation.

The cathedral next in importance to St. Andrews was that of Glasgow, which, like the primatial see, was later on in history raised to archiepiscopal rank.²¹ Tradition points to St. Kentigern (popularly known as Mungo, or "the well-beloved") as the first Bishop of this see. There, after a long life of apostolic labor, he was laid to rest in 612. The humble wooden church and monastery of the saint, built on ground hallowed for Christian burial by St. Ninian²² in the fifth century, formed the site of the more substantial erection placed there through the munificence of David I., son of St. Margaret, in 1123. This later building, however, was destroyed by fire about fifty years after its completion, and it was left to Bishop Jocelin, a former abbot of Melrose, to commence a more spacious cathedral, which devotion to St. Kentigern, the apostle of Glasgow, led him to erect over the tomb of that saint.

To rouse interest in his project Jocelin persuaded his namesake Jocelin, Cistercian monk of Rievaulx, to write the life of St. Kentigern, which is still extant. To obtain funds for the building expenses the Bishop established the Guild of St. Kentigern, whose members, protected by royal warrant, collected alms in every quarter of the realm for the pious work. It is a proof of Bishop Jocelin's untiring zeal and energy that sixteen years after, in 1187, a new church was finished and ready for consecration. It is a matter of doubt as to whether any portion of this building yet remains, though some authorities think that at least a part of the lower church may be ascribed to him. The present Cathedral was probably commenced by Bishop William de Bondington (1223-1258). That prelate procured from the Provincial Council of the Scottish Church, which met at Perth in 1242, an enactment which required every parish priest in the realm to urge upon his parishioners every Sunday and holy day between Ash Wednesday and Low Sunday the duty of contributing towards the building; pastors were enjoined to expound to the people plainly, in the vulgar tongue, the indulgences granted to those who should give alms for the proposed work.²³ By means of these collections the lower church and choir were probably completed. A bell tower and the transepts were added during the twenty years that followed, and after this nothing more was done for a considerable period. About the beginning of the fourteenth century the present nave was commenced; early in the following century the chapter house, with the sacristy above it and the present

²¹ Except where other references are indicated, the information here given regarding this Cathedral has been obtained from Mr. Eyre-Todd's splendid "Book of Glasgow Cathedral," published in 1898. ²² *Vide*, "Vita S. Kentigerni," Pinkerton's *Lives*, c. ix. ²³ *Regis. Epis. Glasg. Bannatyne Club*, p. xxviii.

stone spire, were built. Archbishop Blacader finished the under-croft of a south transept which was destined never to be completed, and built the rood-loft and the staircases to the lower church about 1508. Since that time nothing has been added, but, as will be seen later, much has been removed.

Glasgow Cathedral is the only one on the mainland which was suffered to stand unmolested, as far as its main buildings were concerned, during Reformation troubles. Its western towers, to the indignation of antiquaries of the present day, were removed in 1846 and 1848, on the plea that they disfigured the building, although they are considered to have dated from the period of Bishop de Bondington. But for this the church, as a building, would be as complete now as it was before the Reformation.

Considered as a cathedral, it is not of large dimensions. Its nave measures 155 feet in length and 30 in breadth, and rises to the height of 90 feet. The aisles are lofty, but narrow. Over them runs a triforium of pointed arches with clustered pillars. The transepts are very short, extending scarcely at all beyond the width of the nave and aisles; this construction was rendered necessary by the nature of the ground on which the church stands. The choir is 127 feet long and 80 feet high, and an aisle runs all round it, even behind the high altar; the square end of the church, behind this aisle, is taken up with four small chapels for altars. The architecture of the nave is pointed and is symmetrical in style, as it was built on one design; it consists of eight bays. While the aisles are groined in stone, the roof of the nave is of wood. A richly decorated closed screen separates it from the choir, and forming part of it are two stone altars, standing one on either side of the entrance. It is remarkable that these altars escaped all "reforming;" they are probably unique in Scotland.

Beautiful as the church undoubtedly is, it cannot claim extraordinary distinction as regards its upper portion. The gem of the building is the splendid under-croft, which though it is commonly called the crypt, is in reality a distinct church. In its southeast corner is St. Kentigern's Well, now covered up by a wooden cap. This vaulted building rests on more than thirty beautiful clustered pillars of various dimensions and design. In the centre the groining of the roof converges towards the spot, where, under the high altar of the church above, four slender columns support the "catafalque," as it is called, over the flat slab which covers the remains of St. Kentigern and his mother, St. Thenog. At the northeast corner of this lower church stands the fine chapter house, its vaulted roof supported on a massive central pillar. Above it is the sacristy, a building almost exactly similar. Even in its present bare state the

lower church with its fine pillars of varied design and its small pointed windows with graceful tracery is strikingly beautiful. When it was fitted up with altars, together with hangings and the various requisites for Catholic worship it must have been truly magnificent. A distinguished architect who visited the Cathedral with a friend of the writer characterized the style of the exterior as of third-rate merit, the interior as only second-rate, but the lower church as a building of unique beauty. Other authorities have spoken of it as unrivaled in Europe.

In the days of its glory the Cathedral contained about thirty altars. One stood against each of the great clustered pillars of the nave, so disposed that the celebrant faced east. The dedications of most of these have been identified with painstaking research by the present Catholic Archbishop of Glasgow, whose lecture on the subject, delivered before the Glasgow Archæological Society, is incorporated in Mr. Eyre-Todd's fine volume. There were thus sixteen altars in the nave, besides the two at the rood-screen, which still exist; the latter were dedicated to the Holy Rood and Our Lady of Pity. In the choir were the high altar, dedicated to St. Kentigern, and three others behind the eastern aisle. Two others in the upper church brought the number to twenty-four. The lower church had St. Kentigern's altar over his tomb, another Lady altar and four others. Thus there were in all thirty altars for the use of the thirty-two canons who formed the chapter. The undercroft, built by Archbishop Blacader towards the close of the fifteenth century, is also a vaulted building of great beauty. It extends at right angles to the under church and seems to have been intended as a crypt to an extension of the south transept.

The ornate ritual of the ancient Sarum Rite, carried out amid such surroundings, must have presented many a gorgeous spectacle of mediæval splendor.²⁴ The fittings of the church, including the vestments and altar furniture, were on a scale of great magnificence as extant inventories show. The high altar was surmounted by a carved and gilded canopy hung with silken curtains and the altar itself was adorned with more or less precious frontals in accordance with the rank of the feast. Many such pieces of furniture appear in the inventories.²⁵ It was from the contents of the presses in which such decorations were stored that Bishop Robert Wishart (1272-1316) was accused of providing material for Bruce's coronation robes before he crowned him King at Scone.

Many of the Bishops of Glasgow held high offices of state. No

²⁴ A description of some of these functions was given in a previous article of this *Review*. *Vide*, October, 1898. ²⁵ *Vide*, Walcott, "Ancient Church of Scotland," p. 182.

less than ten were Chancellors of the kingdom. Several were in other respects men of mark. Thus Bishop Jocelin, besides his labors in building the Cathedral, obtained for Glasgow from King William the Lion the grant of a burgh with a market on Thursdays. In 1182 he journeyed to Rome and obtained from Pope Lucius III. the absolution from censure of the same King William. He received from Pope Clement III. the assurance of the dependence of the Scottish Bishoprics upon the Apostolic See alone. William Malvoisin was Bishop of Glasgow before being translated to St. Andrew's. Bishop Walter (1208-1232) took part in the Fourth Lateran Council. William Rae (1335-1367) built part of the original Glasgow bridge, which was removed in 1850 only. Walter Wardlaw was made Cardinal and Papal Legate in 1385. Bishop John Cameron besides being Chancellor was made by James I. in 1424 Secretary of State. James Beaton, uncle of the celebrated Cardinal, was Archbishop of Glasgow before his translation to St. Andrews. He was at one time Lord Treasurer. Archbishop Gavin Dunbar (1524-1547), nephew of the Aberdeen Bishop of that name, was tutor to James V. He advised that King to establish the College of Justice, now the Supreme Court of Scotland. Besides giving two bells to the western tower of the Cathedral, he founded the collegiate churches of St. Thenog's Gate, Glasgow and Biggar, in Lanarkshire. James Beaton (1551-1603) was the last Catholic Archbishop and was nephew to Cardinal Beaton. He was present at the marriage of Queen Mary to the Dauphin in 1558. At the Reformation he retired to France, carrying with him the treasures and archives of his Cathedral, which he deposited in the Scots College at Paris. Queen Mary restored to him the revenues of his see in 1598, but he never returned to Scotland, which by that time had, as a nation, wholly renounced Catholicity.

In 1490 King James V. petitioned the Holy See to raise Glasgow to archiepiscopal rank, stating as a reason that it "surpassed all the other cathedral churches of his realm by its structure, its learned men, its foundation, its ornaments and other very noble prerogatives."²⁸ His request was granted in 1492.

Glasgow's evil day came with the advent of Puritanism. "The altars," says Archbishop Eyre, "the stalls with their canopied work, the sculptures and the painted glass, were destroyed in 1559. At this time of general destruction an order was given for the destruction of the altars and sculptures, but with the proviso that 'you take good heed that neither the desks, windows or doors be anywise hurt or broken, either glasswork or ironwork.' Lord Glencairn conducted the work here, and when a mob is let loose, how vain are

²⁸ *Vide*, Walcott, "Ancient Church of Scotland," p. 190.

provisos or restrictions as to sparing windows or doors! All the other cathedrals on the mainland were wrecked and destroyed during that convulsion. Glasgow alone remained."²⁷

To the credit of the city be it said, the beautiful building is now well cared for and regarded as the pride of Glasgow. The choir is used for Presbyterian worship and fitted up with pews and a hideous reredos behind a communion table, but the nave is free and unencumbered and presents a beautiful picture of pure Gothic architecture. The lovely under-croft, like the nave, is left undesecrated by heretical services; the windows have been filled with modern stained glass and the whole structure is kept clean and neat. To the Catholic heart it is a subject of rejoicing that one can freely visit and pray beside the body of Glasgow's apostle, who amid all the changes that have gone over his burial place, has been left undisturbed in the tomb in which he has reposed for thirteen centuries.

Following the accepted order of the various sees during the middle ages, the Cathedral of Dunkeld, in Perthshire, now claims our notice.²⁸ This see was founded at about A. D. 1127, but the church, dedicated to St. Columba, which forms the subject of this sketch, was not commenced until quite a century later. The choir, as was often the case, was the first portion completed; traces of early English architecture are to be distinguished there. It was, however, reconstructed in 1320 by Bishop William Sinclair, and restored, after being given to the flames by English invaders, by Bishop John de Peebles. In 1406 Bishop Robert de Cardeny began the nave. Bishop Railstone built the aisles with stone carried from Burbane quarry in baskets on the backs of horses, owing to the absence of roads. Bishop Lauder finished the church and consecrated it in 1468.

When completed the Cathedral consisted of a building 224 feet in length. Its nave was 120 feet long, 60 broad and 40 high. Its choir, without aisles, measured 104 feet. A square chapter house stood on the north side of the choir. The architecture was chiefly of the pointed order; the pillars of the nave, which was seven bays in length, were massive, circular shafts measuring 13 feet round—an instance of an earlier style combined with a later, a not unusual feature in Scottish churches. The windows of the aisles were particularly beautiful, combining no less than eight distinct patterns of tracery. The great west window was a very fine specimen of French flamboyant style with remarkably intricate forms.

Besides a large tower at the west end of the north aisle, there was

²⁷ Eyre-Todd, "Book of Glasgow Cathedral," p. 323. ²⁸ For reasons already given, it may be as well to state that the chief authority followed with regard to Dunkeld is Walcott's "Ancient Church of Scotland."

a small octagonal turret which ran up above the height of the gable of the nave, on the south side of the main doorway. It had the appearance of a watch-tower, being pierced with loop-holes to light the staircase within and surmounted by a parapeted gallery. Two of the bells in the large tower bore the names of St. George and St. Columba.

A visitor to the Cathedral in the fifteenth century would have found at the entrance to the choir, as at Glasgow, the two altars of Our Lady and the Holy Cross. At the latter was preserved a relic of the sacred wood. Around the church were altars dedicated to St. Michael, St. John the Baptist, SS. Andrew, Stephen, Martin, Ninian, Holy Innocents and others. The reredos of the high altar, dedicated to the titular, St. Columba, was beautifully painted with representations of twenty-four miracles of the saint. It was the gift of Bishop Lauder, who presented other rich ornaments also to this altar. Among them were images of angels, massive candlesticks and fifteen chandeliers for wax tapers. In the sanctuary was a lectern of brass, from which the Gospel was sung by the deacon. It was decorated with statues of the four evangelists and upheld by the figure of Moses with arms outstretched. The choir screen bore painted representations of apostles and saints and over the stalls were figures of Kings, Bishops and others—a reminder to the canons to remember the benefactors of the church in their prayers. The sacristy was well furnished with rich vestments and hangings.

The Bishops of Dunkeld seem to have suffered considerably from time to time from the incursions of hostile clans upon their territories. It was for defense against such that Bishop Cardeny (1396-1436) built for himself and his successors a fortified palace near the Cathedral. It has now disappeared, though the name of "Castle Close" still designates its site. An idea may be gained of the troubles of ecclesiastics in lawless times by the fact that Bishop Lauder (1450-1476) was celebrating Mass on the feast of Pentecost, when an armed band, led by an Athol chief, broke into the church. To avoid their arrows the unfortunate prelate was forced to leave the altar and climb up aloft to hide among the beams of the roof. The chief had been previously imprisoned by the Bishop and thus took his revenge.

It had not been considered safe, previous to Bishop Lauder's time, to attempt to hold a diocesan synod at Dunkeld. Prudence dictated the Carmelite church at Perth as more secure. But when, at length, towards the end of the fifteenth century, more peaceful days dawned, it was possible to hold the assembly in the newly erected chapter house. Even as late as 1516 a scene of violence attended the installation of Bishop Gavin Dunbar. A rival claimant, Andrew

Stewart, opposed the entrance of the rightful prelate by a shower of shot from the Cathedral tower and palace. The whole country, however, was soon aroused in defense of their Bishop, who at length gained access to his Cathedral.

Some of the Bishops of Dunkeld are worthy of note. Bishop John Scott, an Englishman, was a special favorite of King Alexander III. The zealous prelate petitioned the Pope for the erection of part of his diocese into the See of Argyll, since he understood not the language of the inhabitants "called Irish"—in other words, the Celtic tongue. He became a monk and was buried at the Cistercian Abbey of Newbattle in 1203. Bishop Hugh de Sigillo was so kind and charitable to the poor that he acquired the name of "Poor Man's Bishop." He died within a year of his consecration in 1214. Bishop Geoffrey Liverance (1236-1249) introduced the Sarum Rite into his Cathedral. William Sinclair was styled by King Robert Bruce his "own Bishop" on account of that prelate's gallantry during an invasion of the English in 1317. The Bishop rallied a band of retreating Scottish cavalry under the leadership of the Sheriff of Fife, by the inspiring cry: "All you that love Scotland's honor, follow me!" At the same time he taunted the craven Sheriff with the wish that the King would hew off that faint-hearted dignitary's gilded spurs. The result of the Bishop's action was the thorough rout of the English. Bishop George Brown (1485-1514), who had been consecrated at Rome by Pope Sixtus IV., was a thoroughly pious prelate and a strict observer of discipline. "He wrought no small reformation in all parts of his diocese,"²⁹ appointing Gaelic preachers for the Highlanders who knew no English. Bishop Gavin Douglas (1516-1522) is held in renown in Scotland as a distinguished scholar. He wrote many poetical works and was the first to translate Virgil into English.

The troubled days of the Reformation left their mark on the venerable Cathedral. The Lords of the Congregation despatched in 1560 the following letter to their "trusty friends the Lairds of Amtuby and Kinwalyd." The writing is believed, from its similarity to his signature, to be that of Lord James Stewart:

"Trusty Friends,

"After most hearty commendation, we pray you fail not to pass incontinent to the Kirk of Dunkeld, and take down the whole images thereof, and bring down to the kirkyard and burn them openly; and likewise cast down the altars, and purge the kirk of all kinds of monuments of idolatry; and this ye fail not to do as ye will do us singular pleasure; and so commit you to the protection of God. Fail not but ye take good heed, that neither the desks, windows nor doors be any ways hurt or broken—either glasswork or ironwork.

(Signed)

"ARGYLL,
"JAMES STEWART,
"RUTHVEN."³⁰

²⁹ Keith, "Scottish Bishops" (ed. Russel), p. 92. ³⁰ "New Statis. Account of Scotland," Vol. X., p. 976. The spelling has been modernized.

The latter part of the injunction, as Archbishop Eyre has remarked concerning Glasgow, was disregarded, for the Cathedral was completely sacked, the windows smashed and doors torn from their hinges. Tradition affirms that what these emissaries of the congregation had left undemolished was destroyed by the Laird of Cardeny, the lateral descendant of one of Dunkeld's most worthy Bishops who had done much in his time to beautify the building which his degenerate relative was to desecrate. The Laird, among other unholy deeds, unroofed the whole church.

In 1600 the Cathedral was fitted with a new roof that it might serve as a parish church. It had not yet seen the last of violence and bloodshed. After the death of Dundee at Killiecrankie, his troops engaged at Dunkeld with the Cameronians, 1,200 in number. From 7 o'clock in the morning of August 21, 1689, until 11 o'clock at night the inhabitants of the town took refuge in the Cathedral. When the troops had retired it was the only building which had not been destroyed by fire.³¹

The venerable pile still forms a picturesque feature in the landscape lying by the banks of the Tay. Its gray tower rises from among the trees which shade its ruins, beautiful still in their decay. The choir is still used for Presbyterian worship. More than £5,000 (\$25,000) were spent on its restoration during the last century.³²

An interesting relic of the old Cathedral is still preserved among the MSS. of the University Library, Edinburgh, in the shape of some of the music books once used in its choir.³³

The first authentic record of the See of Aberdeen occurs in 1150, when the name of Edward, Bishop of Aberdeen, occurs in a grant of King David I. to the Abbey of Dunfermline.³⁴ There seem to have been at least three churches erected at different times on the site of the Cathedral whose remains are still to be seen. Of the first, or original church, no record exists; the second, built by Bishop Matthew de Kyninmund in the twelfth century, gave place to another erected by Bishop Hugh de Benham and Henry le Chen, and which the latter prelate consecrated towards the end of the thirteenth century. Finally Bishop Alexander de Kyninmund in 1357 demolished the old church and began an entirely new erection. He died before the walls were 18 feet high. Bishop Lichtoun (1422-1440) built the north transept and commenced other portions. In 1445 Bishop Lindsay roofed the church and paved it. Bishop Elphinstone completed the great central tower in 1489 and presented the fourteen bells. Bishop Gavin Dunbar finished the western towers and south transept in 1522. Bishop Stewart built the chapter house in 1532.³⁵

³¹ "New Statis. Acct.," Vol X., p. 978. ³² "Ordnance Gazetteer of Scot." ³³ Keith, "Scottish Bishops" (ed. Russel), p. 93 (note). ³⁴ "Regist. Dunferm," Bannatyne Club, p. 8. ³⁵ Walcott, "Ancient Church of Scotland," p. 97. *

Thus it was only entirely completed about thirty years before the Reformation storm broke upon it. The church was dedicated to St. Mary and St. Machar.³⁶

So full an inventory is still extant of the ornaments and treasures of the Cathedral that it is possible to give a tolerably correct picture of this noble building as it must have appeared in Catholic ages. Instead of a description of mere dry details, it will, perhaps, be more agreeable reading if the writer gives a picture of Aberdeen Cathedral as it would have met the eye of a sixteenth century pilgrim. Let the reader, then, imagine himself as one of a pious group of travelers arrived in the old city late in the evening of July 1 in the year of grace 1557. It is the vigil of one of the chief feasts connected with the Cathedral—the Visitation of Our Lady, which is celebrated in that church with more than wonted solemnity.

By 6 o'clock on the following morning St. Machar's Church is astir with a large throng of devout Christians. At 5 o'clock and twice again during the hour the bells have pealed in festive fashion to announce the Matins office, which always commences at 6. The church is unique in one respect—so say the townsfolk with much pride—it is the only Cathedral in the world built entirely—*i. e.*, from its western extremity as far as the transepts—of gray granite. Its quaint western towers and the severe simplicity of style seen in the west front are accounted for by the hard nature of the material. Yet there is much rugged grandeur in the building as the bright beams of the early sun light up its solid masonry on the July morning in question. The visitor enters by the north porch, which is known as the "marriage door;" for here is usually commenced the marriage ceremony, the bridal train passing on into the church afterwards for the Nuptial Mass. Entering the nave, he finds himself in a severely plain building. Its massive round pillars have very little carving, and its clerestory windows are almost devoid of ornament. Yet there is a wealth of wood carving in wainscot and screen work and in the beautiful pulpit. The oaken ceiling, too, is glowing with gold and colors, decorated with shields bearing the arms of Kings, Bishops and nobles belonging to many Christian countries.

Through the screens which shut off the altars in the aisles burning tapers glimmer in honor of the feast. Before the altar of St. Catherine hangs the pendant chandelier wrought with nine flowers each holding a taper. The generous benefactor of the church, Canon Clatt, presented it many years ago, as well as the beautiful triptych which is to be seen outspread at the back of the altar. St. Columba's altar, and St. Michael's and St. Andrew's, and all the other side altars in their respective chapels are adorned for the feast. But that of Our

³⁶ This was the apostle of the city, an old Celtic saint, one of St. Columba's disciples.

Lady in the nave attracts the special attention of visitors to-day. Before it stands the large candelabrum given to the church by Bishop Elphinstone of saintly memory. It is filled to-day with lighted tapers in countless number. High above it are the statues of Our Lady of Pity and her Divine Son, both of them adorned with crowns of silver gilt set with precious stones, while the altar itself is resplendent in its gorgeous frontal of blue and yellow satin brocade.

Beyond the rood-screen, in the choir, the nineteen canons with the vicars and choristers are singing Matins. At the conclusion of the office the Mass of Our Lady, sung here every day at this hour, is solemnly celebrated. The celebrant and his ministers wear rich vestments of white velvet wrought with gold; their amices are adorned with collars and their albs "appareled"³⁷ with the same material. Four cantors in copes standing abreast near the screen and holding their staves of office lead the chant; the canons in choir copes, the vicars in surplices and furred hoods and the boy choristers in blue cassocks with surplices join in the Gregorian melodies of the "Mary Mass."

But the Solemn Mass of the day is celebrated later with much more splendor. The fourteen bells in the steeple ring out a tuneful peal at intervals during the hour between 8 and 9. At the summons our pilgrim again repairs to the Cathedral. The office of Tierce is just over and preparations are being made for the procession before Mass begins. A precious cross of silver is borne first, and the clergy and canons follow in due order. Immediately before the Bishop, who brings up the rear, is carried a costly silver image of Our Lady, the gift of the Treasurer, Andrew Lyall, in 1499, and ordained by Bishop Elphinstone to be borne in procession on all the chief feasts. After making the round of the church the procession enters the choir. The celebrant and his ministers, clad in rich white silk vestments, their embroideries thickly set with pearls, enter the sanctuary as the cantors intone the Introit of the day.

The altar is decked as for a festival. Rich carpets cover the pavement and leaves of sweet-scented bay are strewn in the choir. The walls are hung with tapestry depicting the life of Our Lady. Twenty-four chandeliers of brass, bearing lighted tapers, stand around. On the north side stands a low altar, upon which are placed silver statues of Our Lady and St. Machar, the precious relic of the arm of St. Fergus in a silver shrine, crystal reliquaries containing other sacred relics and much of the rich plate belonging to the well-

³⁷ An "apparel," in mediæval phraseology, meant an oblong piece of embroidery or rich stuff stitched near the hem of the alb, both behind and before; smaller pieces adorned the cuffs. Such ornaments are still to be seen in churches where Gothic vestments are worn.

furnished sacristy. The high altar is surmounted by a carved and gilded canopy, known as the "sacrament house," and from it depends the golden pyx, shrouded in costly veils of blue and gold and containing the Blessed Sacrament. It is a scene of solemn splendor befitting the house of God.

Contrast such a pilgrimage as this with a recent visit paid by the writer to St. Machar's on a bleak March day. The gray old towers and granite walls had doubtless changed but little; for their solid material does not readily lend itself to ruin. The startling change was to be found in the interior of the building. There are the massive pillars still, and the glowing roof has been retouched; but in the spot where once stood the rood-screen and the altar of Our Lady of Pity a great organ rears its carved front and gilded pipes, with pulpit and precentor's pew before it, while a large window of poor design forms a background in place of the former opening into the canon's choir. No altar, no carved screens or side chapels, no statues or stained glass windows are to be seen as of old, but everywhere comfortable cushioned pews fill up the available space. All the building that remains is there precisely because it was too strong to be hewed down. Lady chapel and transepts, formed in softer stone, have gone. Choir proper there never was; the stalls were placed under the central tower between the transepts.

The change was wrought here, as elsewhere, by a rabble of so-called "reformers," who swarmed into the Cathedral in January, 1560, spoiled it of its ornaments, stripped the lead from the roof and battered down all they could. The bells they shipped off to Holland, but by Divine judgment, as it seemed, the vessel with its freight perished in sight of land.

Bishop Gordon had foreseen the coming peril and had placed in keeping of some of the canons the treasures of his church, though they seem to have eventually disappeared—possibly seized by some of the spoilers. In the inventory,³⁸ drawn up on the occasion, is mentioned among other costly pieces of plate, "a chalice of pure gold, with the pattin (paten) thereof, 3 pointed diamonds in the foot thereof and 2 rubies of B. Dunbar's gift of 52 ounces." Many fine vestments, hangings and adornments of the altar appear in the same list.

Before proceeding to relate the after events of the Reformation, it may be well to allude here to some of the Bishops of this see who were distinguished among the prelates of their day and have not yet

³⁸ It is this inventory, printed in the "Registrum Episc. Aberd." (Spalding Club), that has furnished matter for the above description. The other authorities followed are Walcot, "Ancient Church of Scotland" (pp. 97-109), and "Collections for the Shires of Aberdeen and Banff" (Spalding Club), Vol. I. (pp. 150 *seq.*).

been mentioned. Ralph de Lambley (1247), formerly Benedictine Abbot of Arbroath, is said to have traveled through his diocese on foot to preach to his people and to have lived as a monk in his episcopal palace. Henry le Chen, besides building a great part of his Cathedral, erected a fine bridge over the Don 72 feet in length and 60 in height. Gilbert de Greenlaw (1390-1424) was sent on an embassy to Charles VII. of France. He was made Chancellor of the kingdom in 1396. Henry de Leighton (1424-1441) was one of the commissioners sent to London for negotiating the ransom of King James I. Thomas Spens (1459-1480) was Keeper of the Privy Seal and envoy in several legations. He erected a hospital for the poor in the city of Edinburgh. The most distinguished of all, William Elphinstone, held many offices of state, such as Chancellor and Privy Seal. Besides doing much for his Cathedral he founded the University of Aberdeen. This prelate built a fine bridge over the Dee, for which he bequeathed £10,000 (\$50,000). He was one of the most learned and pious Bishops of his time. Bishop Gavin Dunbar (1518-1532) carried out Bishop Elphinstone's bequest regarding the bridge, and endowed a hospital at Aberdeen for twelve poor men in the very year in which his death occurred.³⁹ One of the statues placed by him in the Cathedral was an image of Our Lady which he removed from a chapel near the "Brig of Dee." When the Cathedral was desecrated this statue was rescued and conveyed to the Continent. It is still honored as "Our Lady of Aberdeen" or "Our Lady of Good Success," in the Church of Finisterre, Brussels.⁴⁰

The finishing touches to the spoliation of Aberdeen Cathedral are related by a seventeenth century writer. His account, which could scarcely be improved upon, shall be given *verbatim*: "Wednesday, the 5th of August (1640), the Earl of Seaforth," with others whom he mentions by name, "came all riding up to the gate to St. Machar's Kirk, ordained Our Blessed Lord Jesus Christ His arms to be cut out of the forefront of the pulpit thereof, and to take down the portraiture of the Blessed Virgin Mary and Our Saviour in her arms, that had stood since the upputting thereof, in curious work, under the ceiling at the west end of the pend (*i. e.*, arched space) whereon the great steeple stands, unmoved till now; and gave order to Colonel Master of Forbes to see this done. . . . He caused a mason strike out Christ's arms in hewn work, on each end of Bishop Gavin Dunbar's tomb (this stood in the south transept), and siclike (likewise) chizel out the name of Jesus, drawn cypher ways (*i. e.*, the monogram I. H. S.), out of the timber wall on the foreside of

³⁹ Keith, "Scottish Bishops," pp. 107, etc. ⁴⁰ *Vide*, Waterton, "Pietas Mariana Brit.," pp. 296, etc.

Machar's aisle." Two years later the same writer chronicles another outrage: "Upon the 16th day of December Dr. Guild and Mr. William Strachan yoked William Charles, wright (*i. e.*, carpenter) in Aberdeen, to the down-taking of the back of the high altar, standing upon the east wall of Bishop Gavin Dunbar's aisle, as high nearly as the ceiling thereof, curiously wrought of fine wainscot, so that within Scotland there was not a better wrought piece. The craftsman would not put his hand to the down-taking thereof till Mr. William Strachan, our minister, laid first hand thereto, which he did, and syne (*i. e.*, afterwards) the work was begun. . . . Now our minister devised a loft (probably a gallery, so dear to the Presbyterian heart), for ease of the people at sermon, going athwart the kirk south and north . . . and with this back of the altar and haill (*i. e.*, the whole of the) ornaments thereupon he decored this beastly loft; whereas forty pounds would have cost as meikle (*i. e.*, much) timber as would have done the samen, if they would have suffered the foresaid ornament to stand."⁴¹

The "loft," which seems to have been built across the transepts, was not long suffered to adorn the building; for the English soldiers in 1652 carried off the softer stone of the east end, which they thus wholly demolished, to build a fort. This weakened the central tower, which fell with a crash in 1688, burying in its ruins all that remained of that portion of the building. Thanks to the stable material and solid masonry of the remainder, it still survives—a relic of the former glories of a holy shrine. Amid the trees of the churchyard beyond stand the richly decorated tombs of Bishop Lichtoun and Dunbar with that of another prelate, name unknown. Except the traces of groining which may still be discovered outside the present eastern extremity, these tombs are all that can be seen at the present day of that portion of the Cathedral. Yet the granite building with its nave and aisles and quaint twin towers with stunted looking spires—a prominent object from the railway which passes close by it—stands firm and compact as ever, and in its stable endurance typifies the unchanging and undying faith in whose honor it was reared.

MICHAEL BARRETT, O. S. B.

St. Benedict's Abbey, Fort Augustus, Scotland.

⁴¹ Spalding, "Troubles in Scotland," pp. 192, 316.

THOMAS HENRY HUXLEY.

"I may safely say that I never came from your house without thinking how good he is; what a tender and affectionate nature the man has! It did me good simply to see him."—(*Leslie Stephen.*)

"His was the most beautiful and the most manly intellect I ever knew of."—(*Professor A. Hubrecht, of Utrecht University.*)

"There has been no man or woman whom I have met on my journey through life whom I have loved and regarded as I have him, and I feel that the world has shrunk and become a poor thing now that his splendid spirit and delightful presence are gone from it. Ever since I was a little boy he has been my ideal and hero."—(*Professor E. Ray Lankester.*)

"Looking back across an interval of many years and a distance of half the circumference of the globe, I have never ceased to be impressed with the manliness and sincerity of his character, his complete honesty of purpose, his high moral standard, his scorn of everything mean or shifty, his firm determination to speak what he held to be truth at whatever cost of popularity. And for these things 'I loved the man, and do honor to his memory, on this side of idolatry, as much as any.'"—(*The late Jeffery Parker.*)

"Of all the men I have ever known, his ideas and his standards were, on the whole, the highest. He recognized that the fact of his religious views imposed on him the duty of living the most upright of lives; and I am very much of the opinion of a little child, now grown into an accomplished woman, who, when she was told that Professor Huxley had no hope of future rewards and no fear of future punishments, emphatically declared: 'Then I think Professor Huxley is the best man I have ever known.'"—(*Sir Spencer Walpole.*)

"The surest-footed guide' is exactly true, to my feeling. Everybody else among the great used to disappoint one somewhere. He—never!"—(*Anon.*)

"He was so splendidly brave that one can never repay one's debt to him for his example. He made all pretense about religious belief, and the kind of half-thinking things out, and putting up in a slovenly way with half-formed conclusions, seem the base thing it really was."—(*Anon.*)

THE life of Huxley is one of those problems which the modern Christian moralist is bound to confront, and for which he must find an honest explanation if he is able. Catholic theology tells us that no man can remain long in ignorance or doubt of the existence of God and at the same time be sincere. It implies, moreover, that the life of such a man, if closely examined, will reveal the cause of his unbelief. To each and every human being who has arrived at the use of reason, so many theologians teach us, God gives a sufficiency of grace to attain belief sufficient for salvation. If belief and salvation are not attained, the blame rests on the side of man alone. Yet here we seem to be confronted with one whose single aim throughout was the manifestation of truth as opposed to falsehood, and whose whole life showed itself, to those who knew him best, as a life beautiful, and true, and lovable, at the same time that the man himself grew from greater to greater doubt as to the reality of the existence of God and of all the supernatural order. Is not such a life a flat contradiction to the doctrine of the theologians?

Before attempting an answer to this question two important points must be borne in mind. The first is, that no matter how well we may know the outward life of a man, and no matter how far we may think we have entered into his soul, there must always remain, even

in the most transparent, an inner depth which no human power can reach, and which is known to himself and God alone. Not even the angels, St. Thomas tells us, can read the heart of man, much less a fellow human being. And if this is true even of the most intimate of friends, much more so must it be of those who are not known to one another in life, but who must build their acquaintance up, either from the accounts of others or from the works which they have performed. In making an estimate of the motives of a man's life and action there must always remain unfathomed a depth of both good and evil, which may, and often will, contain the very essence of the matter of inquiry.

The second point is connected with the first. It is that the present examination is intended in no way to lead either to the condemnation or to the vindication of Huxley's life and principles. Its object is, so far as he is concerned, purely negative. Attack has often enough been made upon the doctrine of the Church concerning confirmed unbelievers; it has been, tacitly at least, repeated in the case of Huxley by his admirers, and openly by himself when he was yet alive. To repel this attack it is not necessary to condemn Huxley; it is enough if reason can be given for supposing that the expression of the man in his letters and writings does not compel us to free him from all blame. The question, then, comes to this: Is the life of Huxley such as to force the Church to modify her teaching with regard to the culpability of unbelief?

Whatever may be the ultimate conclusion of our inquiry, it must be acknowledged at the outset that there is much to be admired, and much to be praised, in Huxley's work and character. He possessed a rare talent; he had an indomitable will, and he was ruled by a laudable ambition to do his best, and to tolerate nothing in himself or in others which might savor of falsehood. The fruit of his work was the natural outcome of these qualities. Whatever he did he did thoroughly, whether it were in original scientific research or in retailing the results of his labor to his pupils. His field of knowledge was ever widening; he seemed to consider nothing amiss, nothing alien to his one main subject. He never stood still, never went back; it is to his credit that he could say that—perhaps with one single exception—at the end of his life he could look back upon all he had written on science and not wish a single word unsaid. As a teacher, too, he stands preëminent. Patient, clear, convincing in his exposition, he nevertheless refrained from pressing his own views on the minds of those who sat under him.

"One day," writes Fr. Hahn, S. J., once his pupil, "when I was talking to him our conversation turned upon evolution. 'There is one thing about you I cannot understand,' I said, 'and I should like a word in explanation. For several months now I have been attending your course, and I have never heard you mention evo-

lution, while in your public lectures everywhere you openly proclaim yourself an evolutionist.”

Now it would be impossible to imagine a better opportunity for insisting on evolution than his lectures on comparative anatomy, when animals are set side by side in respect of the gradual development of functions. But Huxley was so reserved on this subject in his lectures that, speaking one day of a species forming a transition between two others, he immediately added:

“When I speak of transition I do not in the least mean to say that one species turned into a second to develop thereafter into a third. What I mean is that the characters of the second are intermediate between those of the two others. It is as if I were to say that such and such a cathedral, Canterbury, for example, is a transition between York Minster and Westminster Abbey. No one would imagine, on hearing the word transition, that a transmutation of these buildings actually took place from one into another.”

But to return to his reply:

“Here in my lectures (he said to me) I have time to put the facts fully before a trained audience. In my public lectures I am obliged to pass rapidly over the facts, and I put forward my personal convictions. And it is for this that people come to hear me.” (*Life and Letters* II., 405; *Revue des Questions Scientifiques*, Oct., 1895.)

Perhaps nothing proves the thoroughness of Huxley so well as the pains he took to make his language a worthy medium for the conveying of scientific knowledge to others.

“I have a great love and respect for my native tongue,” he says in one place, “and take great pains to use it properly. Sometimes I write essays half a dozen times before I can get them into the proper shape, and I believe I become more fastidious as I grow older.” (*Life and Letters* II., 291.)

The result of this painstaking was a command of language which put him easily at the head of the writers of his school. All looked up to him as their spokesman. Darwin himself spoke of him as the champion of evolution before the reading world. And he deserved the title. No writer has ever made science so attractive as has Huxley. Every page of his essays contains something that is characteristic and winning. He is musical, he is vivid, he is detailed; no pains are spared to say what he has to say, and to say it well, and clearly, and with attraction. The sentences are balanced, there is alliteration in plenty; and no one who has read much of his works can think of his manner without recalling that subdued irony—sometimes not subdued—which is always with him. As a specimen, notice the freshness, the vividness, the musical rhythm helped out by alliteration, the evenness of balance in such a passage as the following:

“By way of escape from the metaphysical will-o'-the-wisps generated in the marshes of literature and theology, the serious student is sometimes bidden to betake himself to the solid ground of physical science. But the fish of immortal memory, who threw himself out of the frying-pan into the fire, was not more ill-advised than the man who seeks sanctuary from philosophical persecution within the walls of the observatory or of the laboratory. It is said that ‘metaphysics’ owe their name to the fact that, in Aristotle’s works, questions of pure philosophy are dealt with immediately after those of physics. If so, the accident is happily symbolical of the essential relation of things; for metaphysical speculation follows

as closely upon physical theory as black care upon the horseman." (*Nineteenth Century*, April, 1879, p. 597.)

Equally fascinating is his power of telling a story or of illustrating his theory by a well-drawn simile. The explanation of his reasons for religious doubt by means of the clock is an excellent example. It runs:

"If the evolution theory is correct, the molecular structure of the cosmic gas stands in the same relation to the phenomena of the world as the structure of the clock to its phenomena.

"Now, let us suppose a death-watch, living in the clock case, to be a learned and intelligent student of its works. He might say, 'I find here nothing but matter and force and pure mechanism from beginning to end,' and he would be quite right. But if we drew the conclusion that the clock was not contrived for a purpose, he would be quite wrong. On the other hand, imagine another death-watch of a different turn of mind. He, listening to the monotonous 'tick! tick!' so exactly like his own, might arrive at the conclusion that the clock was itself a monstrous sort of death-watch, and that its fixed cause and purpose was to tick. How easy to point to the clear relation of the whole mechanism to the pendulum, to the fact that the one thing the clock did always and without intermission was to tick, and that all the rest of its phenomena were intermittent and subordinate to the ticking! For all this, it is certain that kitchen clocks are not contrived for the purpose of making a ticking noise.

"Thus the teleological theorist would be as wrong as the mechanical theorist among our death-watches, and probably the only death-watch who would be right would be the one who should maintain that the sole thing death-watches could be sure about was the nature of the clock-works and the way they move, and that the purpose of the clock lay wholly beyond the purview of better faculties. Substitute 'cosmic vapour' for 'clock,' and 'molecules' for 'works,' and the application of the argument is obvious." (*Science and Culture*, p. 306.)

To fight with Huxley a clever writer was needed, and one trained in science to boot; such a rival it was not easy to find.

Each of these qualities was a great power for good; and as such in great measure he used them. Nevertheless, in each was contained a germ of evil, which nothing but careful watch and discipline could prevent from growing into full vigor. He was clever; but his talent did but seem to increase his natural restlessness. Not that this restlessness implied any wavering; from the first he accustomed himself to set his goal before him, and to leave nothing untried until that goal was attained. If tenacity of purpose is to be considered the highest ideal in character, then Huxley was great indeed. In this respect he would often compare himself to a bull-dog, and he was worthy of the comparison. But this is quite consistent with what is here meant by restlessness—a chafing at every curb, a refusing to be hampered or fettered in anything that concerned himself, an impatience of opposition to his own ideas and theories, an excessive tendency to make light of and scorn, perhaps even to condemn as liars, those whose knowledge seemed to be inferior to his own, a straining in work which, however admired among men in these days, nevertheless marks a mind that does not find rest and peace in that order of life which nature has disposed for man.

For this restlessness and for its consequences, it is true, Huxley was not himself wholly to blame. His education was not such as to

teach the need of subjection; his circumstances throughout life did but foster confidence in himself.

"From boyhood up," writes his son and biographer, "vaguely conscious of unrest, of great powers within him working to find expression, he had yet been to a certain extent driven in upon himself. He had been somewhat isolated from those of his own age by his eagerness for problems about which they cared nothing, and the tendency to solitude, the habit of outward reserve imposed upon an unusually warm nature, were intensified by the fact that he grew up in surroundings not wholly congenial. One member alone of his family felt with him that complete and vivid sympathy which is so necessary to the full development of such a nature." (*Life and Letters I.*, p. 35.)

Huxley's own account of his early days confirms the impression here given.

"Kicked into the world a boy without guide or training, or with worse than none," he writes to Charles Kingsley, "I confess to my shame that few men have drunk deeper of all kinds of sin than I. Happily, my course was arrested in time—before I had earned absolute destruction—and for long years I have been slowly and painfully climbing, with many a fall, towards better things." (*Life and Letters I.*, 223.)

The real significance of this restless spirit, allowed in the beginning to have full play and never duly brought into subjection, was made apparent as time went on. "I went upon my principle of having a row at starting," he wrote on one occasion to Tyndall (*cf. Life and Letters I.*, p. 120); and this principle he maintained to the end. It won him eminence in his own field of learning; but it also carried him further. In spite of his own professions and protestations, it is impossible not to write him down as overruled by a spirit of intolerance. The wider his influence reached the more intolerant he became. And with this intolerance there grew up a violence of language never wholly wanting to him, but more apparent in his personal comments. No man must cross his path or he must pay for it, be he Bishop or nobleman, statesman or philosopher. No religion or religious practice shall be tolerated which does not conform to his views, be it of the severe type of the Scotch Presbyterian or the all-embracing breadth of the Church of England, or the elaborate but time-honored ceremonial of Rome. No principles shall be propounded which do not appeal to him and conform to his practice, whether it be in matter of a nation's education or an abstruse point of metaphysics, or the meaning of an author's writings. In each of these ways his restlessness under restraint revealed itself from the beginning. As time went on the outer man learnt to conform to a certain normal calm; but to the end the inner combative spirit remained, and death caught him in the midst of a last polemic on a subject both philosophical and theological.

It is easy to illustrate this at various periods of his life.

"It is clear to me," he had written at the beginning of his career, "that for a man of my temperament, at any rate, the sole secret of getting through this life with anything like contentment is to have full scope for the development of one's faculties. Science alone seems to me to afford this scope—law, divinity, physics

and politics being in a state of chaotic vibration between utter humbug and utter skepticism." (*Life and Letters I.*, p. 93.)

"Utter humbug!" He hit upon this word early in life, and it rang through everything he wrote for the rest of his days. It was a good catch-word, and it served its purpose well on many an occasion. To the world he defined it as whatever was opposed to truth; but by truth he meant whatever did not tally with his own ideas. The use of the word did not only deceive the many; it deceived himself still more and was the cause of many a false conclusion.

In the same spirit we find him later in life acknowledging allegiance to no master, ranking with no school.

"Not among fatalists," he says, "for I take the conception of necessity to have a logical and not a physical foundation; not among materialists, for I am utterly incapable of conceiving the existence of matter if there is no mind in which to picture that existence; not among atheists, for the problem of the ultimate cause of existence is one which seems to me to be hopelessly out of reach of my poor powers. Of all the senseless babble I have ever had occasion to read, the demonstrations of these philosophers who undertake to tell us all about the nature of God would be the worst, if they were not surpassed by the still greater absurdities of the philosophers who try to prove that there is no God." (*Life and Letters I.*, p. 412.)

This last sentence contains several points which are typical of Huxley's method. It opens with characteristic intemperance and violence—"Of all the senseless babble I have ever had occasion to read." One sometimes is inclined to wonder how much of them he did read; for he seldom quotes them except to refute them, and at times almost brags of his want of familiarity with them. But there is more yet that is noteworthy. The sentence goes on to speak of "philosophers—who undertake to tell us all about the nature of God." Huxley knew as well as we do that no philosopher nor school of philosophers had ever attempted anything so impossible; but it would not suit his argument to say so. He tells no lies; he accuses no one; he does not even assert that such a school of philosophers does exist. Nevertheless, among his hearers and readers there were few who would not have included in this condemnation all those who professed belief in a personal God, and Huxley knew it. By a sweeping exaggeration he has succeeded in confounding truth with falsehood—this paragon of veracity who can boldly describe himself as "almost a fanatic for the sanctity of truth" (*Life and Letters II.*, p. 46), and who can say: "So far as I know myself . . . my sole motive is to get at the truth in all things." (*Life and Letters II.*, p. 281.)

Similar instances of unfair representation of the position opposed to him are not wanting. Mr. Gladstone, in the "Genesis" controversy, had to complain of this treatment.

"While acknowledging," he writes, "the great courtesy with which Professor Huxley treats his antagonist individually, and while simply listening to his denunciations of the Reconcilers as one listens to distant thunders, with a sort of sense that after all they will do no great harm, I must presume to animadvert with considerable freedom upon his method; upon the sweeping character of his advo-

cacy; upon his perceptible exaggeration of points in controversy; upon his mode of dealing with authorities, and upon the curious fallacy of substitution by which he enables himself to found the widest proscription of the claims of the Book of Genesis to contain a divine record upon a reasoned impeachment of its scientific accuracy in, as I shall show, a single particular." (*Nineteenth Century*, Jan., 1886, p. 2.)

The writer proceeds to justify his complaint in detail. Similarly speaks another antagonist, the Duke of Argyll. Examining Professor Huxley's use of the word "science," he says:

"In common parlance this word is now very much confined to the physical sciences, some of which may be called specially experimental sciences, such as chemistry, and others exact sciences, such as astronomy. But Professor Huxley evidently uses it in that wider sense in which it includes metaphysics and philosophy. Under cover of this wide sweep of his net, he assumes to speak with the special authority of a scientific expert upon questions respecting which no such authority exists either in him or in any one else. It seems to be on the strength of this assumption that he designates as pseudo-science any opinion, or teaching, or belief different from his own." (*Nineteenth Century*, May, 1887, p. 771.)

To the same effect is the accusation of Dr. Wace, another rival in the arena. At the close of an article written in self-defense after an attack made by Huxley he writes:

"Perhaps I need say no more for the present in reply to Professor Huxley. I have, I think, shown that he has evaded my point; he has evaded his own points; he has misquoted my words; he has misrepresented the results of the very criticism to which he appeals, and he rests his case on assumptions which his own authorities repudiate. The questions he touches are very grave ones, not to be adequately treated in a review article. But I should have supposed it a point of scientific morality to treat them, if they are to be treated, with accuracy of reference and strictness of argument." (*Nineteenth Century*, March, 1889, p. 368.)

A striking instance of Huxley's method of making a controversy his own by exaggerating a mere detail is exhibited in one of his disputes with the late Dr. Mivart. The latter asserted in his book on the "Genesis of Species" that evolution was consistent with Catholic theology, and quoted St. Augustine, St. Thomas Aquinas and Suarez to his purpose. Suarez was unknown to Huxley.

"I confess," he writes with characteristic irony, "that this bold assertion interested me more than anything else in Mr. Mivart's book. What little knowledge I possessed of Catholic doctrine"—these words are worth bearing in mind with respect to Huxley's other statements of being open to all sides—"and of the influence exerted by Catholic authority in former times, had not led me to expect that modern science was likely to find a warm welcome within the pale of the greatest and most consistent of theological organizations.

"And my astonishment reached its climax when I found Mr. Mivart citing Father Suarez as his chief witness in favor of the scientific freedom enjoyed by Catholics—the popular repute of that subtle theologian and learned casuist not being such as make his works a likely place of refuge for liberality of thought. But in these days, when Judas Iscariot and Robespierre, Henry VIII. and Catiline have all been shown to be men of admirable virtue, far in advance of their age and consequently the victims of vulgar prejudice, it was obviously possible that Jesuit [*sic*] Suarez might be in like case. And, spurred by Mr. Mivart's unhesitating declaration, I hastened to acquaint myself with such of the works of the great Catholic divine as bore upon the question, hoping not merely to acquaint myself with the true teachings of the infallible Church and free myself of an unjust prejudice, but, haply, to enable myself, at a pinch, to put some Protestant bibliolater to shame by the bright example of Catholic freedom from the trammels of verbal inspiration." (Critiques and Addresses, p. 255; *Contemporary Review*, 1871.)

The length of this quotation needs no apology. It is another comment on the method of him who was "almost a fanatic for the

sanctity of truth," and whose "sole motive" was to "get at the truth in all things." In the result of his inquiry into Suarez he was, as he informs us, "disappointed." From passages in his writings he satisfied himself that Suarez could not be said to countenance the doctrine of evolution. This was his opportunity. The assertion of Mivart had been that evolution was consistent with Catholic theology in general. He had quoted Suarez as one author among several; even if he were wrong in regard to him, his main thesis still stood intact. But Huxley knew better than to enter on the larger topic. He had, as he thought, loosened one stone in the wall; so weakened, the whole castle must be made to fall to the ground. This, then, is the almost bombastic way he sums up his argument:

"Until responsible Catholic authority—say, for example, the Archbishop of Westminster—formally declares that Suarez was wrong, and that Catholic priests are free to teach their flocks that the world was *not* made in six natural days, and that plants and animals were *not* created in their perfect and complete state, but have been evolved by natural processes through long ages from certain germs in which they were potentially contained, I for one shall feel bound to believe that the doctrines of Suarez are the only ones which are sanctioned by infallible authority, as represented by the Holy Father and the Catholic Church." (*Critiques and Addresses*, p. 270.)

But it is not only in such hasty and false deductions that his intemperance of language appears. He is still more unsparing in the epithets he attaches to those with whose opinions he is at variance. In them all one sees the same spirit; and however much he may have succeeded in hiding it in ordinary life, the spirit remained within him to the end.

Here are some instances. Of Bishop Butler he says:

"Read Butler and see to what drivell even his great mind descends when he has to talk about the immortality of the soul! I have never seen an argument on that subject which, from a scientific point of view, is worth the paper it is written upon." (*Life and Letters I.*, p. 242.)

Of some philosophers of this century:

"I believe in Hamilton, Mansell* and Herbert Spencer as long as they are destructive, and I laugh at their beards as soon as they try to spin their own cobwebs." (*Ib.*, I., p. 244.)

Of some of an earlier time:

"Cabanis and Berkeley (I speak of them simply as types of schools) are both asses, the only difference being that one is a black donkey, the other a white one." (*Ib.*, I., p. 244.)

Bacon he describes as "that sneak Bacon." (*Life and Letters II.*, p. 14.) Of Mr. Gladstone, when in the height of the "Genesis" controversy, he says:

"Seriously, it is to me a grave thing that the destinies of this country should at present be seriously influenced by a man who, whatever he may be in the affairs of which I am no judge, is nothing but a copious shuffler in those which I do understand." (*Ib.*, II., p. 122.)

In a similar vein he speaks of Mr. Balfour, on finding that the

*The spelling is Huxley's. It is commented on in the volume.

latter had severely censured agnosticism in his "Foundations of Belief."

"I am inclined to think," he says, "that the practice and the methods of political leaders destroy their intellect for all serious purposes." (Ib., II., 398.)

Newman, of course, he condemns.

"I have been reading some of his works lately," he writes, "and I understand now why Kingsley accused him of growing dishonesty. After an hour or two of him I began to lose sight of the distinction between truth and falsehood." (Ib., II., 225.)

And again:

"I trust you have properly enjoyed the extracts from Newman. That a man of his intellect should be brought down to the utterance of such drivel—by Papistry—is one of the strongest arguments against that damnable perverter of mankind I know of." (Ib., II., 227.)

The late Henry George fares no better of him, and of a predecessor of his he says:

"Did you ever read Henry George's book, 'Progress and Poverty?' It is more damnable nonsense than poor Rousseau's blether. And to think of the popularity of the book! But I ought to be grateful, as I can cut and come again at this wonderful dish." (Ib., II., 245.)

So he treats individuals—the student and subject of none, the judge of all. In the same way he handles schools of thought, particularly of religion. Something has already been said to show his attitude towards Christianity in general. His controversy with Dr. Wace emphasizes his virulence and blindness. Under the garb of freedom of thought he is everywhere intolerant and merciless. For the Catholic Church he has never anything beyond a sneer. His abhorrence of her is so emphatic as to make him draw conclusions too ludicrous to be insulting in regard to her influence upon civilization. Two passages shall illustrate the spirit in which the "fanatic for the sanctity of truth" visited Rome.

"We are just back from a great function at St. Peter's," he writes. "It is the festa of St. Peter's chair, and the ex-dragon, Cardinal Howard, has been bugleman in the devout adorations addressed to that venerable article of furniture, which, as you ought to know, but probably don't, is enclosed in a bronze double and perched up in a shrine of the worst possible taste in the tribuna of St. Peter's. The display of man-millinery and lace was enough to fill the lightest-minded woman with envy, and a general conceit—some of the music very good—prevented us from feeling dull, while the ci-devant guardsman—big, burly and bullet-headed—made God and then ate Him. I must have a strong strain of Puritan blood in me somewhere, for I am possessed with a desire to rise and slay the whole brood of idolators whenever I assist at one of these ceremonies."

Again, two days later:

"I begin to understand old Rome pretty well, and I am quite learned in the Catacombs, which suit me, as a kind of Christian fossils out of which one can reconstruct the body of the primitive Church. She was a simple maiden enough, and vastly more attractive than the bedizened old harridan of the modern Papacy, so smothered under the old clothes of paganism which she has been appropriating for the last fifteen centuries that Jesus of Nazareth would not know her if he met her.

"I have been to several great Papistical functions—among others to the festa of the Cathedra Petri in St. Peter's last Sunday—and I confess I am unable to under-

stand how grown men can lend themselves to such elaborate tomfooleries—nothing but mere fetish worship—in forms of execrably bad taste, devised, one would think, by a college of ecclesiastical man-milliners for the delectation of school girls. It is curious to notice that intellectual and æsthetic degradation go hand in hand. You have only to go from the Pantheon to St. Peter's to understand the great abyss which lies between the Roman of paganism and the Roman of the Papacy. I have seen nothing grander than Agrippa's work—the Popes have stripped it to adorn their own petrified lies, but in its nakedness there is a dignity with which there is nothing to compare in the ill proportioned, worse decorated, tawdry stone mountain on the Vatican." (*Life and Letters* II., p. 90.)

There is a method of warfare which, for a man who makes profession of honesty and open-mindedness above all things else, is, to say the least, unworthy. One has met rival disputants—Newman was one, the late Henry Sidgwick was another, Jowett was a third, Mr. Balfour is a fourth, and there are many more—who, with all their disagreement and with all their aloofness, nevertheless have been slow to condemn their adversaries as lunatics or their position as unbecoming a rational man. Much less have they sought, except by argument or by ignoring, to weaken the position of a rival creed; to endeavor to prejudge it, still worse, to endeavor to warp the judgments of others against it without reason given, worst of all, to use the language of derision in speaking of it, is a practice which they could never have stooped to adopt. Not so Huxley. He tells us again and again he is open to conviction; for all that, it is hard to find a single passage, in his life or in his works which gives any evidence that he has sat down to face the position of an adversary and to allow himself to be influenced by his arguments. And not only this, but with a seeming dread of the possible effect an adversary may produce upon others, he does not scruple to use terms of abuse and ridicule in speaking of them in a way calculated, and intentionally calculated, to poison the minds of all whom his words may reach.

What, then, may be said to be the conclusion at which one arrives after a close study of Huxley's life and works? That he was a master in a special branch of science, that he was thorough in research into everything that pertained to his subject, that he was possessed of a brilliant and rapid intellect and a strength of will which nothing could daunt, that as student, teacher, professor, he proved himself to be among the first, if not quite the first, of the men of his time—all this one may allow him at the outset. His bitterest enemy will not deny him this; those who wish him well may with fairness allow him more. They will allow him the credit which belongs to one who has won for himself, in spite of terrible odds, a worthy place on the rôle of honor. They will allow him a broad margin in the development of his ideas because of the evil circumstances of his up-bringing, whence sprang much of his mistrust of the aid of men, scorn of reputed but sham knowledge, confidence in

himself as the one being upon whom he may safely rely. They will allow much, too, because of the defects of his mental training, which had failed to direct aright his "ambition of youth," which had fostered where it should have curbed "a fiery temper, which ought to (but unfortunately does not) get cooler with age," and which had ill prepared his prompt, quick judgment to face the problems lying before him and most congenial to his nature. Lastly, they will allow him much because of the nature of the adversaries to which he was opposed. Not that, as men, they were weak, but that their cause was often unable to sustain the shock of Huxley's attack. If there is any one fact more than another which proves the hollowness of modern Protestantism, it is the weak front it is compelled to oppose to the onset of modern infidelity. To prove this point would be to reopen a new discussion. For the present it must be enough to say that at times, though by no means always, Protestantism gave way and broke before Huxley's charges. Thus was he led on to despise religion; for beyond Protestantism he knew no other champion.

Still, when all has been said and when every allowance has been made, the case for Huxley cannot be declared to be proved; and this is the whole of our contention. Granting all that is here claimed for him, there still remains much that may lie at his door. There still remain a violence of action and of word, a sweeping of method and of manner, a scorn of the good and true whenever it was offered to him under a form which did not suit his fancy, a determination to win regardless of consequences in every controversy, a reckless flippancy in treating of matters supernatural, even while he acknowledged the possibility of their existence, an assumption of knowledge which none but himself would recognize, a restlessness of life, mixed with a desperate contentment, which gives ground for belief that the old thesis of the scholastics concerning unbelievers has not yet been proved untenable.

A. GOODIER, S. J.

St. Asaph, North Wales.

THE COMMENCEMENTS OF THE NORMANS.

JUST as in the fifth and sixth centuries, so in the ninth an influx of pagan barbarians threatened to destroy Christianity in Europe, only to ensure new and lasting triumphs for the Church of God. But unlike the barbarians of the fifth and sixth centuries, those of the ninth appeared as disorganized hordes, and not with some appearance of national polity; and unlike the Arab invaders of the seventh century, the barbarian Men of the North hurled themselves on Christian Europe with no definite religious object. With the sole exception of Hungary, no new kingdom resulted from the new avalanche of paganism; even in England and in that portion of the Land of the Gaul which was soon to be known as Normandy there ensued merely a change of governmental authority. As for the origin and the early history of the Northmen or Normans, but little in the way of precision can be given. We know that when Western Europe was invaded by that branch of the Indo-European race which ethnologists term the Teutonic, one portion or band established itself in the regions north of the Danube and east of the Rhine; and that the Romans spoke of them as "Germans." Shortly after the meeting between the Romans and these "Germans," the Quirites became masters of Gaul; and then they learned that along the coasts of the Northern Sea, between the mouth of the Rhine and the Baltic, there roamed other Teutonic tribes. Finally it was learned that still other Teutonic bands inhabited those Baltic regions which we know as Sweden, Norway and Denmark; and ere long the civilized peoples became more or less familiar with the names of such hordes as the Suiones (Swedes), the Jutes and the Goths, who, since they inhabited the regions around Scania—the sole portion of the Swedish peninsula known to the Romans—came in time to be designated as Scandinavians. In the first century before our era a later immigration of Asiatic stock overran these "regions of snow," acquiring political and social supremacy and originating the Scandinavian family, a mixture of the Teutonic and the later Asiatic. The Scandinavian traditions narrate that about 70 B. C. one of the barbarian allies of Mithridates, becoming dismayed at the victories of Sylla over that prince, induced an immense number of his tribesmen to emigrate into the far north in order to escape the imminent Roman yoke. This chieftain, whose name was Sigga, soon came to be styled Odin or Wodan, either because he had taken the name of the Germanic god of war, in order to impress the Germanic tribes whom he was subverting, or because his exploits

caused his deification under that name. It must be noted, however, that there are other traditions which assign the advent of Odin to the third or fourth century of our era, and that some of these accounts speak of several different Odins. But it is probably true that Sigga subdued the peoples then inhabiting Southern Russia, and finally became master of Jutland, Denmark (the March or Frontier of the Danes), Sweden and Norway. Sigga, or Odin, assigned his western conquests to his three sons, Skiold receiving Denmark, Niorder Sweden and Seming Norway. Then Odin fixed his residence near Lake Mœlar, in Sweden, and when he perceived that he was growing decrepit he assembled his surviving companions in arms, wounded himself with nine stabs in the form of a circle on his breast, and announced that he was going to Scythia, there to feast eternally with the other gods, and there to await the coming of all good Scandinavians who would die bravely on the field of battle. Few years had elapsed ere the empire of Odin found itself parcelled among scores of petty kings, because of the custom of dividing a ruler's states among his surviving sons; each of these kings was supposed to be obeyed by numerous *jarls* (earls), who were simply leaders of robber bands; over all, both kings and earls, there were "over-kings" at Upsal in Sweden and at Seeland in Denmark, but the authority of these monarchs was nominal. There were, of course, several attempts at a concentration of authority, but none succeeded until the end of the sixth century, when Ingvald, king of Upsal, treacherously murdered twelve of the petty kings, and thus obtained the sovereignty of nearly all of Scandinavia. Conquered in his turn by Ivar, a son of one of his victims, Ingvald made his surviving soldiers dead-drunk in the great hall of his palace, and then firing the building, he went with them to join Odin. Sole monarch of Sweden, Norway and Denmark, Ivar subjugated the regions afterward known as Pomerania, Brandenburg and Mecklenburg, and he even invaded Britain, then dominated by the Anglo-Saxons. Harold, a grandson of Ivar, gave Sweden and Ostrogothia to his nephew, Sigur; and when Sigur revolted in 740, in order to obtain the rest of Scandinavia, the monarch fell in the consequent battle. Sigur was unable to preserve the unity of the monarchy, and he was assassinated by a friend of Harold. Siegfried, one of the petty kings who now reigned in Jutland, was a constant ally of Witikind, the Saxon, in his struggle with Charlemagne. Another, Gottfried, who reigned in Holstein, defied the power of Charlemagne by a grant of asylum to those of the Saxons who refused to submit to that prince.¹

¹ Cantu, "Storia Universale," Book X., Turin, 1862; Capefigue, "Les Invasions des Normands," Paris, 1860; Coquerel (C), "Resumé de l'Histoire de Suède," Paris, 1825; Du Meril, "Prolégomènes à l'Histoire de la Poésie Scandinave, Paris, 1859; Wheaton, "History of the Northmen From the Earliest Times to the Con-

The religion of the Scandinavians differed little from that of the pagan Germans. As with the Germans, Odin was their chief deity, although he was adored under different names as the god of cunning, of triumphant force, of mendacity or of death; he always designated, before a battle, those whom his messengers, "Dyses," were to summon to the banquets of the gods. Among the chief companions of Odin were his wife, Frigga, the beneficent goddess; Niord, the god of storms; Freyr, the god of wealth; Freya, sister of Freyr, the goddess of beauty, the Venus of Scandinavia, to whom the sixth day of the week, *Freytag*, was dedicated; Thor, the eldest son of Odin, and the god of force and of the thunder, who is to kill the great serpent and source of evil at the end of the world, but is to perish because of the exhalations of that monster.

In reference to the characteristics of the Scandinavians, it may be sufficient to state that all of their ferocious customs were derived from their supreme contempt for life, which was itself the very essence of their religion. Their poetry is even more redolent of blood and of cruelty in general than it is of lust; the "Chant of Lod-brog" is representative of all the "Sagas." Thus we hear:² "We have fought with the sword; the eagles and yellow-footed birds (vultures) screech with joy; virgins are weeping continually; the hours of life are passing, but we smile as we die. . . . When I was a mere boy I went to the East in order to give a bloody meal to the wolves; and in battle I sent all the men of Elting to Odin. One day I caused hundreds to bite the dust on the cliffs of England; dews of blood dropped from our swords; my heart was as joyful as though I were sitting at the side of a lovely girl. Another day I butchered a youth with beautiful hair who on that very morn was gay in the company of maidens and was chatting with the widows. We have fought with our swords; and now I perceive that man is a slave of

quest of England by William of Normandy," Philadelphia, 1831; Munch, "Det Norske Folks Historie," Christiania, 1863. ² In the ninth century there appeared a Latin version of this chant, from which we cull the following passages:

"Pugnavimus ensibus,
Hoc ridere me facit semper.
Quod Bolderi (Odin) patris scamna
Parata scio in aula;
Bibemus cervisiam brevi
Ex concavis crateribus craniorum;
Non gemit vir fortis non contra mortem.
Magnifici in Odini domibus
Non venio desperandis
Verbis; ad Odini aulam
Fert animus finire.
Invitant me deæ,
Quas ex Othini aula
Othinus mihi misit.
Lætus cervisiam cum Asis
In summa sede bibam.
Vitæ elapsæ sunt horæ
Ridens moriar."

destiny. . . . But I laugh, and laugh again; for I know that I shall soon sit in the hall of Odin, there to quaff my beer out of human skulls."

It is interesting to compare these verses with those of Lucan as he sings of the fighting Northmen in his "Pharsalia," I., 59:

"Certe populi quos respicit Arctos,
Felices errore suo, quos ille, timorum
Maximus, haud urget lethi metus; inde ruendi
In ferrum mens prona viris, animæque capaces
Mortis, et ignavum reddituræ parcere vitæ."

The reader of this chant is not surprised when he learns that since a natural death was a disgrace for a pagan Northman, he transfixed his old or sick relatives with his lance. When the Scandinavians burned the body of a father, all of his burnable property was thrown into the flames, so that his sons would be forced to procure wealth of their own by war and by rapine. Nothing pleased a Northman more than to fling a living babe from the point of his sword to the expectant point of another's weapon. Perhaps we should not regard as cruelty the Northman custom of exiling, at certain periods, their younger sons from a region where food was not always abundant, and where a large population would have been at least an inconvenience. It was a woman, Gumborg, who devised this scheme, and to it was principally due the success of the Scandinavian "sea-kings," and primarily also the impulse to those invasions which now claim our attention. The first piratical essays of the Normans were conducted in their *holkars* (skiffs), fashioned from hollowed logs, boats which were adapted only to short cruises along the coasts of the Baltic. In 515, however, they had improved so much in the art of shipbuilding that they were able to undertake an expedition in force to the shores of Brittany; but so severely did they suffer at the hands of Thierry, son of Clovis, that three centuries elapsed before they again ventured to the coasts of France. In the eighth century we find them plying their villainous trade on the eastern shores of the Baltic and impudently conveying their spoils to Constantinople for sale. It was then that the term "Varangian," or Corsair, a designation which was soon to be applied to all the barbarian mercenaries in the Byzantine service, became familiar to the Constantinopolitans. In the latter part of the eighth century the shores of Ireland were visited, and Norman kingdoms were founded at Waterford, Dublin, and Limerick. At this time England was no stranger to the "sea-kings," and frequently they preyed on the Orkneys, Hebrides, and the Shetlands. That they made inroads on Greenland and Iceland is certain; and it is not improbable that they sailed as far as our Newfoundland, which they termed Vineland. Expeditions such as these

might well have inspired the "gentlemen-rovers," as their English successors were styled eight centuries afterward, to make a venture on the richer kingdom of Charlemagne. Eginhard tells us that one day while staying in a Mediterranean port, Charlemagne espied in the offing some vessels, the shape of which indicated that they were Norman freebooters; that the sight of the robbers so near to the shore of France brought tears to the Emperor's eyes, and that he told his attendants that he did not fear that in his time the Normans would dare to attack any part of his dominions, but that he anticipated trouble for his people in the near future from that source.

While it is true that piracy was the very life of these Men of the North on whom the light of history was first cast, it is also true that in time there emigrated from the lands of snow and ice many blonde "heroes" who were neither pirates nor their accomplices for any length of time. Thus a number of Normans had been long settled in Novogorod, the great Slavic city which was to become the nucleus of an empire which was destined to be feared, after the lapse of a thousand years, as the "Russian Colossus;" and these offshoots of the Scandinavian stock were the most influential of all the inhabitants of that strong republic, of which the surrounding peoples then said that "no one would dare to attack either God or Novogorod the Grand."

Olden writers tell us that in 839 some merchants of Novogorod, having been on business in Constantinople, accompanied to France an embassy which the Emperor, Theophilus, sent to Louis the Débonnaire, and the Frenchmen discovered that the peaceful traders were Normans. This settlement of the Normans in what is now Russia was productive of important results, for it was by means of the daughter-in-law of a Norman chieftain, of him who became the first "grand duke" or "grand prince" of Russia, and who founded a dynasty which lasted until the end of the sixteenth century, that the work of Christianizing the Russians was initiated. About the year 850 Rurick, a Norman chieftain, aided by two of his brothers, founded the city of Ladoga; and when the perennial discords of the Novogorod Slavs induced them to seek protection from the "Varangian," he responded so efficaciously that the republic became his own, its lands and its strong places being partitioned among his followers, and the sovereignty falling, as it were, into his hands. The domination of Rurick soon extended over the south of what we now know as Russia, and in 865 two of his companions, Askold and Dir, crossed the Black Sea with the intention of carving an empire for themselves out of the territories then subject to the Constantinopolitan sovereign, Michael the Drunkard, and they would have succeeded had not a tempest put an end to their project. After the

death of Rurick in 879 his infant son, Igor, remained under the tutelage of a relative named Oleg, and the work of Norman aggrandizement was continued. Kief was reduced, and after a raid which carried him to the gates of Constantinople, Oleg made a treaty with Leo the Philosopher, and returned laden with spoils.

From 911 to 945 Igor extended his empire; twice he appeared at the walls of Byzantium, but a treaty of alliance saved the lower empire. When he was killed by the Slavs of Lithuania, whose tribute he had tried to augment, his widow, Olga, satiated her vengeance by the treacherous massacre of 5,000 of the Lithuanians during a feast. Olga became a Christian soon after the commission of this crime, receiving the name of Helena at her baptism; but the faith made little progress during her lifetime, and it was not before the baptism of Vladimir, the great-grandson of Rurick, in 988, that the masses of the Russian people entered into the fold of Christ. It may be well to note here that the fact of Vladimir's marriage with Anna, sister of the Greek Emperor Basil II., is responsible for the mistake of the authors who have assigned the conversion of the Russians to the ninth century. These authors confused the reign of Basil II. with that of Basil the Macedonian. And the reader will also note that at this time the Constantinopolitan patriarchate, priests of which were the missionaries of the faith to the Russian pagans of the day, was in full communion with the Holy See. The Photian Schism had been dead for a century. Not until nearly two other centuries had elapsed did the Constantinopolitan patriarch, Cerularius, again segregate most of the Orientals from the Church of Christ; and not before the fifteenth century were the Russians almost totally and definitively dragged into the gulf of schism and of its inevitably consequent heresy.³

Giving our attention now to the influx of the Normans into the territories of the Holy Roman Empire, we would remark, in the first place, that some knowledge of the teachings of Christianity seems to have been acquired by the Men of the North when certain of their more enterprising rovers, having visited the nearer Christian lands of Europe, returned to their homes. Some of these travelers even received baptism in the lands which they visited, and although they generally returned to the religion of Odin, they frequently persisted in their abandonment of many of the customs of Scandinavian paganism—for instance, polygamy, the eating of horseflesh and birds of prey, etc. The efforts of the Saxon, St. Willibrord, for the conversion of the Normans were futile; but the labors of St. Anscarius,

³ Cantu, *loc. cit.*; Chantrel, "Cours d'Histoire Universelle," Paris, 1887; Nestor, Edition Bykkoft, St. Petersburg, 1873, and Schlozer's commentary in his "Nestors Russische Annalen," Göttingen, 1809.

a monk of Picardy, were more fruitful. About the year 826 Harold Klak, King of Southern Jutland, having been dethroned, sought and obtained the aid of Louis the Débonnaire. Probably policy, more than conviction, induced him to receive baptism, and he permitted the Archbishop of Reims to send missionaries to his recovered kingdom.

It was then that St. Anscarius left his monastery of Corbie, in the hope of becoming for the Northmen that which St. Boniface had been for the Germans. After many years of fair success he was made Archbishop of Hamburg, and when the Pontiff sent the *pallium* to him it was accompanied with an appointment as Papal Legate for Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Iceland and Greenland. Much of the opposition experienced by St. Anscarius and his associates proceeded from the kings of Scandinavia, both petty and superior. These monarchs dreaded the political consequences of an adoption of the religion of the more southerly nations, and their ire found vent in numerous expeditions against the coasts of France and Lotharingia. In 845 Hamburg was sacked, and soon afterward the marauders penetrated to the interior of Saxony. Everywhere the destruction of churches and monasteries left tokens of their visits, and for many years there was not a great river of France or of Northern Germany, the mouth of which did not serve as a "station" or base of operations from which the worshipers of Odin would, from time to time, pounce on the lands bordering the stream, in order to appropriate whatever of value had been accumulated since the last visitation. Strange to say, several of the Carolingian Emperors deemed it prudent to legalize certain Scandinavian domiciles in their dominions. Thus the Débonnaire accorded an establishment in Batavia to Harold Klak; and ere long a Norman colony, or rather "station," was permanent on the island of Walcheren, at the mouth of the Meuse. During the reign of Lothaire another band settled in Louvain. Baldwin I., Count of Flanders and son-in-law of Charles the Bald, repelled the Normans from his territory, but at the same time they devastated Lotharingia, Frisia and much of Neustria. In 870, just when the Norman, Rurick, was founding what was to become the Empire of Russia at Novogorod, another Rurick subjugated Frisia. In 876 Rollo ravaged Holland, and then settled permanently on the banks of the Seine, and very soon Godfrey, just repulsed by Alfred the Great in England, took possession of Nimegen and sacked and burned Tongres, Metz, Cologne, Juliers, Coblenz, Treves, and Aix-la-Chapelle. In 882 Charles the Fat granted to Godfrey a large district in the north of what is now Holland, on condition that the Norman should embrace Christianity; and probably Godfrey would have developed his territory into an independent kingdom, had he

not been assassinated by Henry, Count of Franconia, in 885. In revenge for this murder Siegfried, brother of Godfrey, marched on Reims; and it required much money to save the city from the flames. However, in 891 that part of the Empire was delivered from the Normans. In 843 Hasting, chief of some Normans who had appropriated the island of Her in the Loire, after their burning of the grand Benedictine monastery which St. Philibert had founded in the seventh century, made Angers his headquarters; and during the following twenty-three years he pillaged Amboise, Nantes, Tours, and Blois, together with all the lands bordering on the Charente and the Garonne. This indomitable freebooter's career was not checked by the crushing defeat which Robert the Strong inflicted on him at Brissarthe in 866. He immediately embarked his followers on a hundred vessels, sailed to Italy, sacked Pisa, and took possession of Luna in Tuscany, being under the impression that it was the Eternal City, the capital of Christendom. Having discovered his mistake, Hasting proceeded to Britain in order to aid those of his blood who were then resisting the patriotic efforts of Alfred the Great; and when that monarch had forced him to return to France, he became a Christian, in 879, in order to receive the investiture of the County of Chartres.

The banks of the Seine were very familiar to the Normans. As early as 820 they had ascended the river, and in 841 they had pillaged Rouen, while Charles the Bald had saved Paris from their torches only at the cost of much of his treasure. In 885 Siegfried appeared before Paris, which then was of no greater extent than that of the portion which in modern times was to be termed "the city." His force consisted of 30,000 warriors and 700 vessels, and with all the military science of the day he endeavored to reduce the place. But the Parisians, filled with courage by the exhortations and example of their Bishop, Gozlin, and of the abbot of Saint Germain des Prés, and worthily guided by Eudes and Robert, the sons of Robert the Strong, were indomitable. The siege had endured thirteen months without any progress on the part of the Normans, when Charles the Fat appeared at the head of an army; but instead of falling on the besiegers of his faithful subjects, he bought them off with 700,000 pounds of silver and with full permission to ravage Burgundy. So indignant were the Parisians because of this proof of an ignoble mind on the part of their monarch, that they blocked the Seine, thus compelling the Normans to draw their ships on the land for many miles.

The most interesting as well as the most important phase of Norman history is that of the domicilization of this sturdy stock in France, and of its consequent assimilation with the Celtic and Gallo-Roman races. Among the Norman besiegers of Paris in 885, one of the most distinguished for strength, courage, and personal appearance was Hrolf or Rollo, a Norwegian who had already commanded

large bodies of his own men of Norway, and also of Danes, in the English wars. When the siege of Paris was raised, Rollo spent three years with his countrymen in England; but finding that the spoils of the Anglo-Saxons were less valuable than those of France, he soon became a thorn in the side of Louis le Bègue. When Charles the Simple, who had occupied the throne conjointly with his father, became sole King in 898, he realized his inability to cope with Rollo; and he deemed it wise to recognize the Norman's authority in regions which could not be taken from him, but on the condition that he should embrace Christianity, and should avow himself a vassal of the French crown. The event proved that the Simple had judged wisely. The Treaty of Saint Clair sur Epte secured to Rollo all that portion of Neustria which then came to be known as Normandy, and also the sovereignty of several cantons of Brittany; and from that day the new vassal of France became an impassable barrier for all outside Normans.

The quondam pirates of the North soon became excellent Christians and worthy Frenchmen, who added an immense force to the then decrepit Carolingian monarchy—so great, indeed, a force that for years there was to be a bitter enmity between the successors of Rollo and the House of Capet which supplanted the derelict successors of Charlemagne. The sincerity of the conversion of Rollo and his companions soon asserted itself; everywhere in Normandy there ensued intermarriages with the old Gallo-Roman-Frankish stock, and a new Christian French family presented itself with none of the baneful characteristics of the devotees of Odin. Theft and brigandage soon became so much a mere tradition in that Neustria which had been so long their victims, that the olden chroniclers could record, as an instance of the prevalent honesty, the fact that in one of the Norman forests a lost golden bracelet hung from a branch for three years without being disturbed. Under the successors of Rollo, the duchy of Normandy became a powerful State which now protected the kings of France, and then caused those monarchs to tremble; some of the subjects of these dukes will be met by us as they found Norman principalities in Italy. The immediate successors of Rollo were: William "Long-Sword," son of Rollo (926-942); Richard I. (942-996); Richard II. (996-1026); Richard III. (1027); Robert "the Magnificent" or "the Devil," whose fame is rather legendary (1027-1035), and, finally, the celebrated William the Conqueror, a natural son of Robert.⁴

Approaching now the subject of the first Norman invasions into

⁴ Cantu and Chantrel, *ubi supra*; Muratori, "Annali d'Italia," at years 1006-1198; Licquet, "Histoire de Normandie," Rouen, 1855; Depping, "Histoire des Expéditions des Normands et de leur Etablissement en France," Paris, 1826.

England, we must remind the reader that nearly all the olden English historians designate as "Danes" those Northmen from whom their ancestors suffered during the early Middle Age; probably they knew more about Denmark than they knew of Sweden and Norway, since the first was then the most powerful of the Scandinavian kingdoms. The reign of Egbert, sometimes termed "the Great," was somewhat troubled by "Danish" invasions, but the first serious incursion occurred during the reign of Ethelwulf, the son of Egbert (836-858). In 851 London and Canterbury were pillaged and many monasteries and convents were destroyed. As a rule, during all these invasions the Britons, who were Celts, experienced very little of the Danish ferocity; the terrible horrors of Pagan warfare were the lot of the Anglo-Saxons, although they were ethnological cousins of the Northmen of that day. The reason for this discrimination can be found in the fact that the British Celts hated the Anglo-Saxons as their oppressors, and that therefore, whenever they could, they made common cause with the enemies of the *Sassenach*, even though those enemies also were of Teutonic stock. Between the years 841 and 851 the Northmen were too well occupied in France to pay any attention to their English quarry, and when they pounced upon it in the winter of 851, Ethelwulf so severely defeated them, that ten years elapsed ere they again tempted fortune in England. Ethelwulf took advantage of this period of tranquillity to make a pilgrimage to Rome, whither he had already sent his youngest son, Alfred, with a prayer that Pope Leo IV. would confirm the young prince and confer upon him the royal unction. Returning from the Eternal City, Ethelwulf visited Charles the Bald, and won from that monarch the hand of his twelve-year-old daughter, Judith. After the repression of a revolt on the part of Ethelbald, his eldest son, Ethelwulf prescribed the order of succession to his crown in the persons of the pardoned Ethelbald and his brothers, Ethelbert, Ethelred and Alfred. Ethelbald (858-860) had an uneventful reign, if we pass in silence his sad mistake of espousing Judith, the young widow of his father—an error which he rectified in consequence of the protestations of the Bishop of Winchester and the indignation of his people. Judith soon married Baldwin, Count of Flanders, and became the ancestress of Matilda, the wife of William the Conqueror. The reigns of Ethelbert and Ethelred (860-871) were devoted to combat against the ravaging Danes, and the monarchs displayed steadfastness and courage. But in every part of their dominion churches and monasteries were continually sacked and burnt; priests, monks and nuns were slaughtered and towns were held for ransom. Ethelred indeed defeated the enemy in one great battle, but he was mortally wounded in a second and indecisive contest, leaving the throne to the great

Alfred, the last of the sons of Ethelwulf. The two years which Alfred had spent in Rome, and the visit of several months which he had made at the court of Charles the Bald, had imparted to him a refinement and a taste for learning which were seldom perceptible in an Anglo-Saxon of that day. In fact, the culturing projects of the twenty-two-year-old King of Kent and Wessex offended the immense majority of his co-nationals; and it is not improbable that only the fear of the Northmen prevented a revolution which would have sent Alfred from a throne to a library. Within a month after his accession the young monarch inflicted severe losses on the Northmen, rendering them but too willing to retire from Reading to London, a city which then belonged to Mercia rather than to Wessex, and which was to remain for several years in the hands of the invaders. In 877 the lands of Mercia were divided among the "Danes," and again Wessex was penetrated. As an old chronicler says: "Mickle of the folk over sea they drove, and of the others the most deal they rode over; all but King Alfred, who with a little band hardly fared after the woods and in the moor-fastnesses." With the exception of a few of the Anglo-Saxons of Hampshire, Wiltshire and Somerset, none of Alfred's subjects regarded a further struggle against the Pagans as aught but hopeless, and even the sanguine spirits expected to merely postpone the day when all Wessex and Kent would share the fate of Northumbria, Mercia, and East Anglia. However, amid the marshes bordering the Parret and the Tone a bit of firm ground was found by Alfred to be fit for the purposes of an inland fortress; and with this spot as a base of operations, he began a guerilla warfare which in a few weeks developed into an open-field campaign. The Danes were even besieged at Eddington, with the result that their leader, Guthrun, declared his willingness not only to abandon Wessex forever and to give Alfred as many hostages as the king would demand, but also to become a Christian, and to aid the propagation of the faith among his followers. A definitive treaty was concluded at Wedmore, whereby boundaries were fixed between the English and the Danish possessions, and whereby it was agreed that Anglo-Saxons and Northmen should be equal in the face of the laws of the contracting parties. This treaty gave, on parchment, the city of London to Alfred; but it was only in 886 that its possession was attained, and that its control enabled the Anglo-Saxons to hold the Thames, thereby protecting Kent, Wessex, and Anglo-Saxon Mercia. One of Alfred's first cares when he assumed the rule of London was the repairing of the old Roman walls which had been allowed to fall into decay; and he showed his good judgment by erecting a tower which, two centuries afterward, William the Conqueror so well approved that on its site he built the

famous Tower of London. The last years of Alfred, however, were not free from anxiety on account of the Northmen. In 893 the celebrated Hasting, son of a Norwegian earl, landed in Britain at the head of a large force, and with the aid of the Northmen of East Anglia contested with Alfred until 897 the domination of what was commencing to be known as England. But the Norwegian was finally repelled and proceeded to France, where he was to become a vassal of Charles the Simple as Count of Chartres. When his mother's crime placed Ethelred on the throne in 979, England again became the prey of the Northmen. Among the means which were devised in order to secure the integrity of the kingdom was a marriage of the monarch with Emma, the daughter of Richard, Duke of Normandy. The union was solemnized in 1002; but the repeated infidelities of Ethelred alienated the affections of Queen Elgiva, as she was named on the day of the marriage, and the Norman duke could feel nought but resentment toward the insulter of his blood. Then Ethelred bethought himself of a measure which has covered his name with infamy. He gave secret orders to all his officers in the various towns and counties to organize for a given day a general massacre of all the Danes in their respective jurisdictions. "Of the motives which prompted this bloody tragedy," says Lingard, "and of the extent to which it was carried we are ignorant. In all probability it was confined to the Danes who had settled in England since the king's accession, among whom were chieftains whom he had allured by grants of lands to his service, and inferior adventurers who, in consequence of his frequent treaties with the invaders, had mixed with the natives and remained among them under the protection of his *grith* or peace. Of the first class we know that Palig, though he had received a princely inheritance and sworn allegiance to the English monarch, had joined his kinsman Sweyn in the last invasion; and it is probable that many others, both chieftains and private individuals, frequently acted in the same manner. Hence there can be no doubt that Ethelred had recourse to this dreadful expedient as a punishment due to their past disloyalty and a measure of precaution to prevent its recurrence on some subsequent occasion." Neither sex nor age were spared in this horrible massacre; in London many were struck down in the churches, wherein the unfortunate Pagans had thought that the Christians might be inclined to mercy. The slaughter was well avenged; during four years Sweyn, King of Denmark, whose Christian sister, Gunhilda, had been one of the victims, ravaged and murdered in all the counties of the coast, and when his thirst for blood had been quenched, he desisted only on the payment of 36,000 pounds of silver. But in 1013 Sweyn again appeared and became master of Wessex, Mercia

and Northumberland, and when he proclaimed himself as King of England, he was recognized by London, and Ethelred found refuge in the Isle of Wight. The death of Sweyn in the following year permitted Ethelred to return to his capital; he was able to repel Canute, who had succeeded Sweyn; but the Dane soon returned, and Ethelred died, leaving to his brother Edmund "Ironside" the task of defending the Anglo-Saxon dynasty.⁵

The reader will have perceived that in the period of which we are treating there were three families of Northmen or Scandinavians; firstly, those resident or quasi-resident in Sweden, Norway, and Denmark, which were the Scandinavian territories, properly so called; secondly, those Scandinavians who had acquired a permanent home in the Slavic lands which they were soon to erect into a commencement of the Russian Empire; and thirdly, those Scandinavians who had domiciled themselves and become naturalized, as it were, in France, and whom alone the average English-speaking student designates as Normans, probably because of the preëminent interest excited in his mind by their conquest of the Anglo-Saxons. Having noted how the Pagan Northmen plied their piratical trade for centuries, and how some of them settled permanently in the countries to the south, only to be thoroughly Christianized and civilized, we must now observe how the home-remaining Northmen formed stable nationalities in the form of kingdoms, and how they also were drawn into the fold of Christ. I. SWEDEN.—In the years 829 and 830 St. Anscharius made his first efforts for the conversion of the Sueones; and when he returned to civilization in order to occupy the newly-erected archiepiscopal see of Hamburg, he sent Gauzbert to continue his work. In 853 he resumed the apostolic task in person, and induced King Olaf to grant permission for a free presentation of the faith in those regions. Having erected a modest church, Anscharius returned to his special charge; but until his death in 865, he took care that some priests should labor in Sweden. After the death of Reinbert, the successor of St. Anscharius, there ensued an interval of seventy years, during which no priest seems to have risked his life in the great work. In 935 Unni, Archbishop of Bremen, labored for a time at Birka, and he was followed by several other missionaries, some from Bremen, others from England. In 964 Eric the Victorious, one of the few early Swedish monarchs concerning whom we have much knowledge, mounted the throne and during the next thirty years subjugated Finland, Esthonia, Livonia and Courland. At first a bitter persecutor of Christians,

⁵ Cantu, Chantrel, Capesigue, *ubi supra*; Michel, "Chroniques Anglo-Normandes," Rouen, 1856; Mallet, "Histoire de Danemark," Geneva, 1777; Lingard, "History of England," London, 1832; Wheaton, *ubi supra*.

he finally received baptism. The next monarch, Olaf III. (995-1026), at the beginning of his reign called Siegfried, an English priest, to Sweden, and was baptized by him. Siegfried continued his apostolate for many years, finally dying at Werens Harad, in Smöland. Siegfried and his associates had great success in Westrogothia, whereas upper Sweden continued pagan for many years. In Westrogothia Olaf founded the Diocese of Skara, and he chose that province for himself when his Pagan subjects insisted that he should select one region as a home for Christianity, leaving the rest of the country to the worship of Odin. Under King Stenkil (d. 1066) the faith advanced greatly in Westrogothia; but this monarch rejected the advice of the Bishops, Adelward of Skara and Æginus of Lund, who wished him to destroy the great temple of Upsal, the chief sanctuary of Scandinavian idolatry. After the death of Stenkil, war ensued between the Christians and the Pagans, and many English priests were martyred; but when Halstan and Inge, sons of Stenkil, regained the royal power, Christianity again began to advance. We find Pope St. Gregory VII. writing an encouraging letter to these joint kings, praising their zeal and piety. During the reign of Swerker (1133-1155) monasteries and convents were first founded in Sweden, and chiefly by means of monks sent thither by St. Bernard. In 1152 Sweden was visited by a Papal Legate in the person of that English prelate, Nicholas Breakspeare, who afterward became Pontiff as Adrian IV.; and we note that one of the results of his mission was the establishment of the custom of sending "Peter's pence" to the Holy See from Sweden. Under the successor of Swerker, St. Eric (d. 1160), the faith was firmly established, even in Upsal; and when Eric undertook his successful crusade against the freebooting Finns, it was with the aid of St. Henry, the first Bishop of Upsal, who afterward became the apostle of Finland, and there received his martyr's crown. St. Henry was constituted the patron saint of Sweden, and his banner was in Catholic days, carried by every Swedish army; the city of Stockholm placed his image in its coat-of-arms, and the Cathedral of Upsal (now Lutheran) still preserves his relics.

II. NORWAY.—Harold, called the *Haarfager*, or the "Fair Haired," first consolidated Norway as a kingdom (885-933) by his subjugation or expulsion of the underkings. His son, Eric, styled the "Bloody Axe," endeavored to secure his patrimony against all sub-division by the murder of all his brothers; but one of these escaped, and afterward dethroned him, whereupon he fled to the protection of King Athelstane of England, who had already been the host of his rival. Hakon, or Haquin I., called "the Good" (938-963), had become a Christian in England, and his first endeavors tended toward a propagation of the faith;

but when he urged the representatives of the nation, in an assembly which he had convened in 940, to abandon idolatry for the Gospel of the Crucified, the fury of the people impelled him to a virtual apostasy by eating food which had been offered to the gods of paganism. Mortally wounded in battle in 960, he expressed his repentance for this act; and when some of his friends offered to convey his remains to England, so that they might repose in consecrated ground, he declared that he did not deserve the privilege. In 967 King Harald essayed violence in order to further the progress of Christianity; but his successor, Haquin Yarl, destroyed every vestige of the faith, and even sacrificed his own son to the idols. Olaf I. (995-1000) had been a wanderer from his youth, and while dwelling among the "Varangians" of Russia, he had embraced the faith. From the day of his accession he adopted every means, instruction, promises, menaces and, unfortunately, violence, in favor of a religion to which, he said, he owed several miraculous escapes from mortal danger; and his success was considerable. Olaf II. (1017-1033), termed at first "the Fat" and afterward venerated as "the Saint," had been a pirate during the occupation of Norway by the Danes and the Swedes; but when he mounted the throne he manifested much zeal in the propagation of Christianity. De-throned by Canute the Great in 1030, he tried to recover his power in 1032, admitting among his soldiers none but Christians, all of whom bore the sign of the cross on their helmets and shields, and whose motto was: "Forward, soldiers of Christ, of the Cross, and of the king!" He fell in battle, and very soon his tomb at Drontheim became a shrine for all Northmen, although the Church has never formally recognized his sanctity by canonization. Iceland was converted during his reign, and a few years afterward Greenland followed her example. The sons of Harald II., aspiring to the throne, incited Sweyn, King of Denmark, to war on Olaf in the year 1000, and for a few years Norway was divided between Sweyn and one of his Norwegian allies.

III. DENMARK.—Of the three Scandinavian kingdoms Denmark was the most powerful at this period. Its unity had been effected by Gorm, called "the Old," a son of Knut or Canute, King of Seeland. Between the years 873 and 935 he had subdued Scania and Jutland, and had forced all the Danish under-kings to recognize his suzerainty. Gorm was a zealous worshiper of Odin, and he tried not only to undo the work of St. Anscarius in Jutland, but also to ruin the cause of Christianity among the newly-converted Saxons of Germany—a proceeding which entailed a war with Henry the Fowler, and resulted in the loss of Sleswig by Denmark. Harold (935-991), called *Blaatand*, or "Black Teeth," continued the anti-Christian policy of his father; but when he had been

conquered by Otho I., the first Holy Roman Emperor of the German line, he received baptism, and ever afterward aided in the propagation of the faith. Toward the end of his life he was dethroned by his son, Sweyn; but the powerful arm of Richard, Duke of Normandy, restored him. However, he was soon killed in battle while resisting a second enterprise of Sweyn. This prince, called *Tinkesbeg*, or "Forked Beard" (991-1014), was ferocious and impetuous, and a Christian only in appearance; in fact, his revolts against his father had been supported only by those Danes who remained attached to idolatry, and as King he persecuted the Church with all his power. Otho III. having taught him that he could not satisfy his paganizing tendencies in the Empire, he began those expeditions which we have noted as troubling the reign of Ethelred, and which eventuated in his proclamation as King of England in 1013. He died in the following year, and was succeeded by his son, Canute the Great. Although Canute had received baptism in his infancy, it was natural that very little regarding the significance of Christianity should have been known by a son of the "Forked Beard." Hence it was that the early years of the reign of Canute were a period of suffering for the English. But in proportion with his gradual attainment of Christian knowledge the reign of this King of Denmark, Norway, and England entered on the way of justice and of prudent kindness; and ere long he acquired the love of the English, especially because of his restoration of the churches, monasteries, and convents which he had destroyed. As a further means of conciliating his insular subjects he espoused the French Norman princess, Emma (*Elgiva*), the widow of Ethelred, with the understanding that the crown of England, after his death, should be inherited by their offspring. Having vanquished the Swedes and having subjected Norway to his sway, Canute furnished to his subjects and to the world an eloquent object-lesson in regard to the efficacious taming of the Northmen by the Church. He took his crown from his head, placed it on the brows of the image of the Crucified in the Cathedral of Winchester, never again to resume it, even for the most solemn ceremonies of state; and then, in the dress of a pilgrim, he set out on a journey of respect to the tomb of the Apostles in Rome. The sentiments of this practically newly-fledged Christian, as they were developed in the atmosphere of the Pontifical throne, are indicated in the letter which he sent to the prelates and people of England as he was about to leave Rome for Denmark:

"Canute, King of all Denmark, of England, of Norway, and of part of Sweden, to Egelnoth, the metropolitan, to Archbishop Alfric, to all the Bishops and chiefs, and to the entire nation of the English, nobles and commoners, greeting! I write to inform you that I have

recently visited Rome, there to pray for the forgiveness of my sins, as well as for the security of the nations subject to my sway. Long ago I vowed to make this pilgrimage, but state affairs and other impediments prevented the fulfilment of the promise; now, however, I thank God most humbly for His having allowed me to visit the tomb of the Blessed Apostles Peter and Paul, and to personally venerate that spot, together with the other holy places which are within and outside the city of Rome. This visit was made by me because I had learned from my teachers that the Apostle Peter had received from Our Lord the keys of the kingdom of heaven and the great power of binding and loosing; therefore it was that I deemed it right to bespeak the intercession of that Apostle with Almighty God. I would have you know also that on Easter Day a great number of exalted personages waited on our lord, Pope John; namely, Conrad, the Emperor, and many chiefs of nations dwelling in the regions between Mount Gargano and the nearest sea; and all of these personages received me most honorably, especially the Emperor, who presented me with some gold and silver vases and several valuable garments. I availed myself of this occasion for a presentation of the grievances of both my Danish and English subjects to the Pope, as well as to the Emperor and the assembled princes, to the end that my people, while journeying to Rome, might not be harassed by so many unjust exactions. Most of the barriers at which these exactions are perpetrated belong to the Emperor and to King Rudolf, and they granted my requests, agreeing that in future my subjects should have free transit, whether they be pilgrims or merchants, on their way to Rome, no detention at barriers and no payment of unlawful tolls being demanded. I also represented to the Pope that when my Archbishops applied for the *pallium*, according to custom, they were obliged to pay exorbitant sums; then the Pontiff decreed that this abuse should end. In fact, in the presence of four Archbishops, twenty Bishops and a multitude of dukes and nobles, all that I requested for the good of my people was accorded by the Pope, the Emperor, and those other princes through whose dominions the road to Rome passes; therefore I thank God for the successful issue of all the projects that I had formed in this regard. And now let you all know that my life has been dedicated to the service of God, to the proper government of my dominions, and to an exact observance of justice. With the help of God I shall make full restitution in all cases where, owing to my youth or to negligence, I have ever violated the rules of justice; and I entreat and command all to whom I have entrusted my government that they do no injustice to either poor or rich, if they prize my friendship or desire to save their souls. Let all persons, both nobles and commoners, find

their rights in the law; and let that law suffer no exceptions, either through fear of the King or out of consideration for the great, or because of the needs of my treasury—I want no money which is procured by injustice. I am about to start for Denmark in order to make peace with the nations who have done their utmost to deprive me of my crown and my life. God has deprived them of power, and I trust that in His goodness He will protect us and humble our foes. When this peace shall have been effected, and when the affairs of my eastern dominions shall have been arranged, I shall return to England as soon as fair weather permits; but I anticipate that return with this letter, so that all of you may rejoice in my prosperity. All of you know that I have never spared myself, and that I never shall spare myself, if the good of my subjects is at stake. And now finally I entreat all the Bishops, as also the Sheriffs, by their allegiance to me and to God, to see that before I return to you all the church dues be paid according to ancient custom; that is, the plough alms, all cattle tithes of this year, the Peter's Pence, the fruit tithes for mid-August, and the Martinmass kirk shot for the parish churches. Should these be omitted, when I arrive the delinquents shall be punished with an exaction of the fine decreed by law. Fare ye well!"

Canute died at Shaftesbury in 1035, leaving two children by Queen Emma, namely, Hardicanute (Canute the Hardy) and a daughter, Gunhilda, who became the wife of Henry, a son of Emperor Conrad, who afterward became Emperor as Henry III. Before his union with Emma, and before he had even dreamed of a Christian life, Canute had begotten two sons, Sweyn and Harold, by his paramour, Alfgiva, the daughter of Alfhelm, Earl of Northampton. The elder was for a time King of Norway, after the death of Olaf II. Harold, called "Hare's Foot," took advantage of the absence of his legitimate brother, Hardicanute, in Denmark, to seize the English throne. The chief event of his reign was the brutal murder of Alfred, son of Ethelred, who had defied him as a usurper. Concerning the religious sentiments of Harold, we are told by Ingulf, abbot of Croyland, who had been a secretary of William the Conqueror, that he was a benefactor of the Church; but other quasi-contemporary chroniclers assert that he ostentatiously absented himself from all religious functions. Hardicanute was recognized as King of England in 1040, after the death of Harold; but he reigned for less than two years, and with him the Danish dynasty in England was extinguished.⁶

We need not dilate on the conquest of England by William the Norman. Our present object is the presentation of features of Nor-

⁶ Lingard, Wheaton and Munch, *ubi supra*.

man history which are not familiar to the average reader, and the chief enterprise of the Conqueror is not one of those features. Certain observations, however, will not be foreign to our intention. Fortunately the prime consequence of the Norman conquest of England was the introduction of the Gallo-Romano-Franco-Norman or French element into the Anglo-Saxonico-British stock as a dominating factor in all matters of refinement and of general culture. The incipient and still rude English language was replaced by the French in all public documents—a system which continued for three centuries, with the result that all literate Englishmen soon read only French or Latin, and that not until 1363 was Parliament opened with a speech in English. But unfortunately for the two nations, with this conquest began that rivalry between the monarchs of France and those of England which was the cause of so many cruel wars during the following four centuries. As Dukes of Normandy, William and his successors were vassals of the Kings of France; but as Kings of England the same princes were independent. The Norman royal vassals of France were ever prone to reflect on their kingship in England rather than on their original obligations; while, on the other hand, the French monarchs ever pointed to the duties of their Norman vassals, in order to lessen the growing importance accruing to those vassals as English sovereigns—*hinc illæ lachrymæ*. The lamentable succession of wars began when Robert, son of the Conqueror, advanced pretensions to Normandy, and was quite reasonably supported by the French King, Philip I. William lost the Vexin, but nevertheless marched on Paris to obtain satisfaction from Philip for that monarch's sneer at his increasing *embonpoint*. He reduced Mantes and gave it to the flames, but received a wound which caused his death, shortly afterward, in Rouen (1087). His body was interred in the Church of St. Stephen, in Caen, and in 1562, when the Huguenot, Coligny, reduced that city, his soldiers rifled the tomb and appropriated the bones, some of which found their way to England. The contemporary and apparently impartial "Saxon Chronicle" draws a quaint picture of William:

"We will describe him as we have known him; for we looked on him. . . . No man durst do anything against his will. . . . Yet among other things we must not forget the good *frith* (the King's Peace) which he made in this land; so that a man that was good for aught might travel over the kingdom with his bosom full of gold without molestation. . . . If he might have lived yet two years he would have won Ireland by the fame of his power, and without any armament. . . . His rich men moaned, and the poor men murmured; but he was so hard that he recked not the hatred of them all. For it was need that they should follow the

King's will withal if they wished to live or to have lands or good or his favor."⁷

While the Saracens were besieging Salerno in 1006, among the defenders were forty Norman knights who had returned from a pilgrimage to the Holy Land; and so well did they perform their duty that the infidels were forced to retire. The gratitude of the Salernitans loaded their deliverers with presents of such value and beauty that when the knights returned to France many of their countrymen yearned for the acquisition of similar objects. Accordingly, ten years afterward, three hundred Normans, led by Drengod, Osmond and Rainulf, tendered their services to the Italians of Magna Græcia against the Byzantines and the infidels; and ere long the Emperor, Henry II., gave them valuable fiefs, and in 1025 Conrad II. invested Rainulf with Aversa and its territory. In 1037 another Norman noble, Tancred d'Hauteville, finding that his patrimony would scarcely bear sub-division among his twelve sons, counseled three of them—Guillaume, Drogon and Humfroy—to seek their fortunes in the South. Followed by their retainers, they entered the service of the Greek Emperor against the Saracens of Sicily, but they found that the Greeks insisted on all the booty which they gained. They revenged themselves by a seizure of the Puglia in 1041, having defeated, if we may credit the writers of the day, 60,000 Greeks with their pitiful 700 combatants. Guillaume, surnamed "the Iron Arm," became count and suzerain of the Puglia, and his brothers bore the title successively after his demise. It was soon seen, however, that many of the exploits of these Normans accorded sadly with their professions of Christianity. Rapine, sacrilege, and murder seemed to be scarcely less familiar to them than they had been to their forebears of the previous century.

When Pope St. Leo IX. mounted the Pontifical throne in 1049, the celebrated Robert Guiscard had turned his terrible arms against the Roman Campagna, and had even usurped the Papal Duchy of Benevento. Moved with pity for the oppressed populations, Pope St. Leo IX. remembered that he was a King as well as a Pontiff; and he called upon his own subjects and upon the other Italians for volunteers with whom he might hope to repel the Norman invaders. He besought Henry III., one of those holy Roman Emperors whose sole reason for being was their obligation to protect the Holy See, to strengthen the Pontifical army; but the German sent only five hundred soldiers. At the head of his forces St. Leo advanced against Guiscard, and the Norman sent an embassy to meet him,

⁷ Capefigue, Lingard and Wheaton, *ubi supra*; Thierry, "Histoire de la Conquête de l'Angleterre par les Normands," Paris, 1825; Licquet, "Histoire de la Normandie," Rouen, 1855.

offering to become a vassal of the Pope-King; but the reply was that the Normans should evacuate Italy. Then ensued the battle of Civitella, or Dragonara, in which the Pontifical troops were routed, and which resulted in the capture of the Pope, who had watched the combat from a neighboring eminence. But as St. Leo, preceded by the cross, went forth to meet his captors, the Normans prostrated themselves at his Pontifical feet, begging for pardon; and in a few days Guiscard, reflecting on the advantages which would accrue to the Norman power in Italy if the Pope were to recognize it, restored His Holiness to liberty and swore perpetual vassalage to the Holy See on the part of himself and his successors.

In 1057 Robert Guiscard succeeded Humfroy as Count of the Puglia, and renewed his act of vassalage to the Holy See; and in 1057, when he had taken Calabria from the Greeks, Pope Nicholas created him Duke of the Puglia and of Calabria, thus according to him supremacy over all the Normans in the ancient Magna Græcia. Not satisfied with the domination of Salerno, Benevento, and of all the Italian territories which had belonged to the Lower Empire, Guiscard captured Corfu from the troops of Alexis Comnenus in 1084; and he would probably have carried his standard into Constantinople had he not been called to save Pope St. Gregory VII. from the troops of Henry IV., the excommunicated King of the Germans. He delivered the Pontiff and afforded him a refuge in the Norman dominions.

In 1061 Roger, a brother of Robert Guiscard, had begun the conquest of Sicily from the Islamites with less than three hundred knights. In 1089 he had driven the Saracens from the entire island, excepting a few mountain fastnesses of the interior, thus saving Sicily not only from Mohammedanism, but from the Greek Schism which had been revived by Cerularius in 1053. Roger governed the island as Grand Count, under the suzerainty of the Holy See, until his death in 1101.

In 1127 Roger II., having mastered the Puglia and Calabria, assumed the title of Roger I., King of the Two Sicilies, a term which now appears for the first time in history and which was borne by his successors of the Norman dynasty—William I., called "the Bad" (1154-1166); William II., called "the Good" (1166-1180); Tancred (1189-1194), and William III. (1194-1198). All of these Norman sovereigns avowed themselves vassals of the Roman Pontiff, declaring to the world that they held their dominions as a fief of the Holy See; and from their time all the Kings of Naples and of Sicily (or of the Two Sicilies), whether they were Suabians, Angevines, Aragonese, Austrians or Bourbons, always acknowledged the Pope as their suzerain. It must be noted, however, that when Robert Guis-

card recognized the right of the Pope alone to confer upon him and his successors the investiture of the Neapolitan and Sicilian territories, he was not actuated by feelings of mere veneration. The Norman knew that since the year 773 the Roman Pontiff had been the lord-paramount of the Duchy of Benevento, which then included all the peninsular territory south of Terracina, excepting only the Duchy of Naples and Gaeta; and that in the Pontificate of John VIII. (872-882) Gaeta also had become a fief of the Holy See. The convictions of the Norman were plainly indicated in the oath of fealty which he took to Pope Nicholas II. in 1059:

"I, Robert, by the grace of God and of St. Peter, Duke of the Puglia and of Calabria, and by the same protection Duke-elect of Sicily, will henceforth be faithful to the Holy Roman Church, and to thee, my liege lord, Nicholas. I shall take no part in any act or scheme against thy life, limbs or liberty; nor shall I knowingly disclose to thine injury the plans which thou mayest entrust to me, and which thou mayest forbid me to reveal. . . . I shall not try to invade, to acquire or to seize, without certain license from thee or thy successors in the dignity of St. Peter, any possessions other than those which may be granted to me by thee or by thy successors. I shall try in good faith to pay annually to the Roman Church the tribute fixed for the lands of St. Peter which I hold or may hold. . . . I shall observe fidelity to thee and to thy successors in the dignity of St. Peter who may confirm to me the investitures which thou hast granted to me. So help me," etc.⁸

REUBEN PARSONS.

Yonkers, N. Y.

⁸ Cantu, Wheaton and Muratori, *ubi supra*; Rosario di Gregorio. "Discorso intorno alla Sicilia," Palermo, 1826; Falcando, "Scriptores Rerum Italicarum," in Muratori; Borgia, "Istoria del Dominio Temporale della Sede Apostolica nelle Due Sicilie," Rome, 1789; Gosselin, "Pouvoir du Pape au Moyen Age," Paris, 1845.

SAINT COLUMBANUS AT LUXEUIL.

WHAT were the original plans of Columbanus and his brethren while they rested in "Brittania" after their quick and pleasant journey from Ireland? Is it possible that the thought of a mission among the Slavs entered his mind, if only vaguely, and was dismissed to be taken up again at a later date? As he looked over the map of Europe, in his little missionary council, was he tempted to take up the rôle that was really reserved for Cyril and Methodius two centuries later? In the "*Vita Sancti Columbani*" of his North Italian biographer and quasi-contemporary disciple, Jonas, it is related that the saint thought once of going to the land of the Wends, who are also called Slavs, in order to illuminate their darkened minds with the light of the Gospel and to open the way of truth to those who had always wandered in error. But when he purposed to take a vow to that effect,

An angel of the Lord appeared to him in a vision and showed him in a little circle the structure of the world, just as the circle of the universe is usually drawn with a pen in a book. "You perceive," the angel said, "how much remains set apart of the whole world. Go to the right or the left, where you will that you may enjoy the fruits of your labors." Therefore Columbanus remained where he was until the way of Italy opened before him. (Jonas, c. 56.)

From the mention of Italy and the fact that this vision is related just before the curious vision of the battle of Tolbiac (612), it seems probable that the idea of a mission among the Slavs occupied Columbanus in the interval between his expulsion from the domains of Theuderich and his acceptance of the call of Theodelinda. In his letter "*ad discipulos*" he seems to refer to this Slav project: "*Mei voti fuit gentes visitare, et Evangelium a nobis prædicari; sed fel modo referente eorum teporem, pene meum tulit animum.*" (Migne, PL. LXXX., col, 271.) Who does not recognize here that root of romanticism the intimate personal role of the mediæval Kelt? The Slavs in question may have been those hordes who had seized after 568 on the ancient seats of the Lombards—modern Styria, Carinthia and Carniola—and by the time of Columbanus' arrival had penetrated the mountainous regions between the Wiener-Wald and the Ems, where the topography yet recalls their colonies. Here their further progress was stopped by the Bavarian tribes. Other Slav tribes had seized by the end of the sixth century on the lands of Friuli and Istria or the modern Tyrol. Contemporaneously, too, the lower Drave and Save had been taken up by Slavs. To the north, Old-Keltic Bohemia had been passing from the Teutonic Marcoman into the possession of Slav Tcheks, whose kinsmen were

already settled in Moravia and along the southern slopes of the Carpathians. The Ruthenians had spread east to Hungary, and other Slavs had made their way into Saxony, Thuringia, Franconia and even Switzerland. If the Emperor Justinian himself was not a Slav, several of his generals were. Greece proper was soon overrun by them so thoroughly that many historians maintain the complete disappearance of the Hellenic blood.¹ These golden-haired Cossacks of the sea were as adventurous on water as on land, and their rude pirogues were already the terror of the Byzantine coast-line and the islands of the Ægean and the Ionian. In time they will retreat before the Avars of Asia, as these will give way to the Bulgars. But from the days of Columbanus they belong to Christian history, for they already are constituted by Providence as a wall of protection between the savage and disintegrating Orient and the Teutonic tribes called to the hegemony of mediæval Europe. Curiously enough, it was at this very time that the Frank merchant Samo (623-668) established a temporary authority over the Tcheks of Bohemia, and reigned from the Elbe to the Oder. Is it not possible that the vision of Columbanus was in some way connected with a certain openness to foreign influences that this incident suggests and that has been always characteristic of the Slav peoples?

The arrival of Columbanus and his band in Wales coincides, very probably, with the career of the great Welshman, Saint David, and the transfer from Cærleon-on-Usk to Menevia of the (so-called) Archbishopric of the Welsh.² It was also the period of the renewed Saxon invasion and final overthrow of the Keltic peoples gathered on the western seaboard for a last resistance. The little band of exiles may probably have wintered in the growing port of Menevia, to take passage in the early spring for Nantes in Armorica, whither so many Old-Britons had already gone before the irresistible Angles and Saxons. There was a certain fitness in their Welsh sojourn. From these churches of Wales had come over to Ireland, not so long before, the good missionaries, David, Gildas and Cadoc. Saint

¹ "Vers la fin du VII. siècle, la grande migration des Slaves vers l'ouest peut être considérée comme terminée. Depuis lors ils n'ont guère fait que perdre du terrain de ce côté. Refoulés par les peuples Germains, ils se sont retournés vers le nord et vers l'est. La colonisation de la Russie orientale et septentrionale a dédommagé la race, et elle reste le fait le plus considérable de son histoire. Au VIIe siècle ils étaient maîtres d'un immense territoire qui s'étendait de la Baltique et de l'Ilmen à la mer Egée et à la mer Noire; de l'Elbe, de la Saale et de l'Ems au Dnieper. Les contreforts des Alpes étaient peuplés de leurs colonies. Le bassin moyen et inférieur du Danube leur appartenait tout entier, sauf certains districts montagneux du Balkan et les prairies de la Theiss et du Danube moyen, au milieu desquels erraient les Avars, destinées à une rapide disparition. L'Egée, l'Archipel, l'Adriatique, la mer Noire, la Baltique, étaient sillonnées par leurs barques. La langue slave est tellement étendue, dit un chroniqueur, qu'on peut à peine s'en faire une idée." Lavissee et Rambaud, "Histoire Générale," I., pp. 694-95.

² Jones and Freeman, "The History and Antiquities of St. David's," London, 1886. Haddan and Stubbs, "Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents Relating to Great Britain and Ireland," I., 121, 123, 148, and the rather fantastic work of J. Willis Bund, "The Celtic Church in Wales," London, 1896., p. 248.

David himself, it is said, had been baptized in Munster, and the Irish Menapii were an offshoot of the Welsh tribe of the same name. All through the fifth and the sixth centuries there are many points of contact between the churches of Ireland and Wales. Old traditions connect the name of Gildas with the history of the Irish Church in the sixth century. If this Gildas be the missionary who wrote the "De Excidio Britanniae," it is not impossible that our saint may have met him, or at least his disciples, and that they drew for Columbanus anything but a hopeful picture of religion in the land of King Arthur.³ Corruption and idleness and riot had invaded the hearts of these sorely-tried Christians since Arthur's victory at Mount Badon (516). When these secular combatants, Kelt and Saxon, emerge again from the dimness of saga in the pages of Bede, the former will take refuge in a sullen, uncompromising and un-Christian withdrawal from all contact with the hated victor. In any case, Columbanus and his companions collected anxiously every information about the Gallic churches, their administration and the temper of the inhabitants, meaning, if all their inquiries were favorable, to make Gaul the term of their romantic "peregrinatio." The Catholic Bishops of London and York had fled only lately—perhaps that very year (589)—into the mountains of Wales, bearing with them the holy relics of their churches; so that the outlook among the Saxons must have been more hopeless than ever. Severn, Tweed and Humber were no longer Keltic streams, save in name.⁴ The Eng-

³ On King Arthur's historic personality and character, the following judgment of Mr. William H. Babcock in the *Conservative Review* (March, 1900) may be of interest: "One gets (from tradition and writing) the impression of a daring, shaping, yet at times anxiously conciliating mind, making the utmost use of the materials at command, the remnants of Roman organization and equipment, the aggressive zeal of fanaticism, the initiative and defensive power of liberty, the fidelity and impulsive valor of the Celtic race—one of the world's great men, too far in advance of his time not to be foredoomed. He fell, if we may believe the concurrent testimony of all records and surviving tales of the people, by those internal forces of treachery and lawlessness which he had never been able to quite wholly control. Not the Saxon enemy overcame him, but Modred with Launcelot and Guinevere. We may not vouch for this as proven history. The legend comes to us like outlines through a mist. If it did not really happen, that was a great soul of ancient days who invented it."

"During the whole of this time, from the middle of the sixth to the middle of the seventh century, the Cymry, who were a singing people, sang the fortunes of the strife, its battles and defeats, its sieges and feasts. Four great bards are said to have flourished among them toward the end of the sixth century. . . . They were Aneurin, Taliessin, Llywarch Hen and Merddin. We cannot quite tell whether the names represent real men. Merddin, who became the Merlin of the Arthur tales, and Taliessin seem to grow before our eyes into mythical personages, but at least we have the poems attributed to these names . . . and the ancient body of them is allowed to be historical and contemporary with the events of which they sing. Stopford Brooke, "English Literature From the Beginning to the Norman Conquest" (Macmillan, 1898), p. 29.

⁴ Pushing their way in their long flat-bottomed boats up the rivers, seizing upon Roman fortresses, like Canterbury and Aldborough, which commanded the fords and marked the course of the great roads, turning the flank of the dense masses of fen and woodland which barred their path by a dexterous use of the paved roads and tributary streams, sometimes climbing laboriously through the forests to the heights of the open uplands, slowly and painfully driving back the bulk of the Celtic inhabitants and imposing their own civilization upon those who were

lish had reached the western seas, and the unity of British Kelticism was henceforth only a memory, though a divine and potent memory, with power to fascinate the imaginations of many an unborn people. Farther north in Hii (Iona) and countless other islets of these wintry seas, his namesake, the noble Columba, was founding a school of hardy missionaries who would one day come southward and conquer for Jesus Christ that Northumbria which just now had been conquered for barbarism and Satan. The Bishop of Rome himself was soon (597) to execute a long-cherished plan of a mission to those Angles whose lovely children had attracted his notice in the slave market at Rome. Truly we are on the borderland between the old Roman life and the first rude phases of mediæval Christendom, and these years are, indeed, every one of them, an *Annus Mirabilis*!

"Accordingly they left Britain," says Jonas, "and proceeded into the Gallic lands." Doubtless, they followed the trail of so many thousands of Keltic Britons who had been inundating Armorica for a century, until they finally made it their own, while in the same proportion the remaining Angles quitted en masse their German homes, and took over the fair valleys and uplands whence the Kelts had fled. Jonas is tantalizingly brief as to the facts of the little company's arrival in Gaul.⁵ He is in the usual mediæval haste to preach

left, the English won their way step by step into the heart of the country. They flocked over from Frisia and the marshes of the Elbe, and the promontory of Denmark, bringing with them their wives and families—the migration of a people, not the march of an army. They settled in little groups of family or tribe wherever the richness of the meadow or the clearing of the wood seemed to promise plentiful subsistence or adequate protection. Just as the English settler in America pushed the Red Indian back from hunting ground to hunting ground, without interfering with their customs or rooting out their religion, so the old English in the fifth and sixth centuries pushed back the bulk of the Celts and the Romanized provincials from the towns and fortresses of Roman Britain into the hills of the Celtic west of the island. . . . Towards the close of the sixth century the work was complete. Celtic Christianity had been driven out of sight and almost out of mind over five-sixths of the country. The worship of the powers of nature under the personifications of Woden, of Freia and of Thor had succeeded to the worship of Christ, and the days of the English week are still left to prove how completely the old civilization had passed away. It is true that among the Celts of Wales and Strathclyde lived on a staunch, if degraded, Church. It is true that across the water in Ireland were springing up schools of sound learning and zealous faith, which were soon to bear unexampled fruit. It is true that in the far North, amid the Piets and Scots, was already founded the great missionary college of Iona. It is probable that through the medium of the enslaved remnants of the Celtic inhabitants were handed down to their barbarian conquerors some traditions of Roman civilization. It is possible that in some places there lingered on for many years despised and isolated congregations of Christians. Nevertheless, with these slight exceptions, over the fair fields of prosperous and fertile England brooded the darkness of an effete and savage creed. Wakeman, "Introduction to the History of the Church of England From the Earliest Times to the Present Day" (Third ed.), 1897, pp. 8-9.

⁵ Jonas has preserved for us the names of some of the original (12) companions of Columbanus. They are Gallus (c. 19), Cominin, Ennoch and Equanach (c. 21, "de Scotorum genere"), Antiernus (c. 18), a younger, and related, Columbanus (c. 29). The names of others are saved in ancient and reliable traditions (cf. Greith, p. 272). Lua, Potentian, Deicola, Sigebert, Aidan and Caldvaldus. Several of them became bishops and founders of monastic centres that were afterwards quite famous, like Lure in Burgundy and Dissentis in Switzerland. Some British clerics, like Gurganus (Jonas, c. 21), accompanied him. When Jonas describes (c. 29) the death-bed scene of the younger Columbanus, he must have had the

about the virtues and to relate the miracles of the saint. It seems probable that they landed at Nantes, then the chief entrepôt for commerce with Britain, and the port to which Brunehilde sent the saint and his companions when she ordered their reimpatriation. They led in all probability a wandering life, first among the people of their own race in the new Brittany that was then a-forming, yet gradually making their way southward through the "Gallic lands." The present text of Jonas wrongly says that it was in the time of King Sigibert that Columbanus came into Austrasia, and that Sigibert was also King of Burgundy. Sigibert was already dead (575), and he was never King of Austrasia. Ordericus Vitalis, writing in the twelfth century, had perhaps a better manuscript of Jonas, in which he may have read his own correct statement that Childebert, the son of Sigisbert and Brunehilde, was then King. He was, indeed, King also of Burgundy, for he had inherited in 593 the domains of his uncle Guntram. Columbanus would therefore have been about two years preaching and teaching through Gaul before his fame had spread to the neighborhood of Metz, whence Childebert, then in his twenty-third year, ruled over the united kingdoms of Austrasia and Burgundy.

"When the holy man with his companions," says Jonas (c. 12), "appeared before the king, the greatness of his learning caused him to stand high in the favor of the king and court. Finally, the king begged him to remain in Gallic territory, not to go to other peoples and leave him; everything that he wished should be done. Then he replied to the king that he did not wish to be enriched with the treasures of others, but as far as he was not hindered by the weakness of the flesh to follow the command of the Gospel: 'Whosoever will come after Me, let him deny himself and take up his cross and follow Me.' Then the king answered and said: 'If you wish to take the cross of Christ upon you and follow Him, seek the quiet of a hermitage. Only be careful, for the increase of your own reward and for our spiritual good, to remain in our kingdom, and not to go to the neighboring peoples.'"

It is possible that the Bishops of Gaul were for something in this insistence of Childebert that Columbanus should not go "to other peoples," but should fix himself in some retired spot. Perhaps, too, the "great learning" of the saint aroused curiosity and the desire of good schools. One remembers easily the Irishmen Clemens and Albinus in the time of Charlemagne and their "selling of wisdom." Awful as were the times, men could yet recall the fact that Gaul had once been famous for scholarship and eloquence. The curious traits that Gregory of Tours tells about the contemporary Chilperic illustrate the barbarian greed of knowledge. The Bishops would

facts from some one of these companions, perhaps from Gallus himself. "Columbanus, struck with fear, made a signal that all should come. His joy lessened his grief at the death of his holy companion. He gave the dying man the Body of Christ as a viaticum, and after the last kiss began the death-song. For they were of the same race and name and had left Ireland in the same company." This is not the only touch of human nature in Jonas—the scene of Brother Antiernus (c. 18) overcome by the horror of life in the Vosges and asking to be allowed to make a "peregrinatio" to the "fair hills of holy Ireland" is highly characteristic.

have another reason for putting a term to these "Wanderjahre" of the Scotie missionaries who had come uninvited among them. The latter had been for some time denouncing in no measured terms the laxity of episcopal administration and the general atonic state of the Christian religion. In a cautious apologetic way Jonas echoes the Columban traditions at Bobbio about the condition of Catholicism in Gaul on the arrival of the holy founder.

"At that time, either because of the numerous enemies from without or on account of the carelessness of the bishops, the Christian faith had almost departed from the country. The creed alone remained. But the saving grace of penance and the longing to root out the lusts of the flesh were to be found only in a few. Everywhere that he went the noble man preached the Gospel. And it pleased the people, because his teaching was adorned by eloquence and enforced by examples of virtue" (c. 11).

Once settled in some retired neighborhood, these restless and loquacious* Kelts from Ireland would cease to be an object of admiration to all Gaul and a reproach to the prelates of a Church that was disfigured by no few or small vices. The pages of Gregory of Tours and his continuator, the so-called "Fredegarius," record turbulence, simony, violence and luxury; the lives of the contemporary saints, like Desiderius of Cahors, confirm the facts of history. It is true that sometimes ecclesiastical writers heighten unintentionally the color of their language—the habit of oral denunciation and the need of rousing a decadent time affect their style. They are to be read somewhat as we read Tacitus and the Roman satirists, with allowance for profound feelings of moral indignation. Such writers pass over habitually the good deeds of a time, the average compliance with the moral law and the ecclesiastical legislation.⁶ They are more often prophets like Salvian and Gildas—even the gentle and sensible Bede is at times swept away by this current. And so, when they are almost alone the accusers of an epoch, a certain common sense of history demands some reserve or diminution of the credit due them as historians, especially when contemporary literature, correspondence and the hundred ordinary channels by which the morality of an epoch is revealed, are no longer in existence. Besides the sources just mentioned, we have for this period only some official poetry, some royal charters, some pious or political correspondence, and the acts of some councils. Anyhow, the official ecclesiasticism of the continent was seldom sympathetic to these

*Date, quaeso, veniam meae loquacitati ac procacitati supra vices laboranti, etc. Columb ad patres Synodi, Migne lxxx., col. 268.

⁶ "On a relevé avec soin dans l'histoire de Grégoire de Tours les crimes nombreux qu'il relate; en regard ne conviendrait il pas de placer les belles actions que ce même écrivain a consignées dans ses écrits hagiographiques? Qu'on dresse une statistique exacte et complète, après quoi l'on pourra se prononcer sur le plus ou moins de moralité des habitants de la Gaule à l'époque mérovingienne; il serait possible que, mis en balance, le bien et le mal se fissent équilibre, ou même que le bien l'emportât sur le mal." Maurice Prou, "La Gaule Mérovingienne," p. 131.

roving "Scoti." More than one denunciation of them exists. They were too intense, too mystic, too simply and sincerely Christian. Their native enthusiasm, their "*perfervidum ingenium Scotorum*," their habitual measuring of duty by the high ascetic perfection of their own lives and the stern letter of the Gospel, their uncompromising demand that all men should live habitually on the brink of the grave, were more than such a society as the Merovingian could easily bear. Patience, "*compositio*," education, tolerance were perforce in the air at a time when it needed not much to make a Merovaesus drag back the powerful Frankish state into nature-worship, or a Chilperic turn Arian again, and play the royal theologian like any Constans or Valens. The moderate and earnest Bishops, most of them as yet Gallo-Roman men, and therefore the most cultured and churchly-minded, would surely deprecate the injection into this situation, this "*époque de transition*," of a stern and troubling prophetism, a constant appeal to the primitive Gospel as against the rather worldly habits of actual ecclesiastical life. Jonas implies (c. 11), in his usual guarded phrase, that the humility, poverty and unworldly attitude of the Scotie monks contrasted sharply with the love of honor and authority, of riches and soft living that were then too common in ecclesiastical Gaul.

"Such piety and love dwelt in them all," he says, "that for them there was only one will and one renunciation. Modesty and moderation, meekness and mildness adorned them *all in equal measure*. The evils of sloth and dissension were banished. Pride and haughtiness were expiated by severe punishments. Scorn and envy were driven out by faithful diligence. So great was the might of their patience, love and mildness that no one could doubt that the God of mercy dwelt among them. If they found that one among them was in error, they strove in common, with equal right, to restrain the sinner by their reproaches. They had everything in common. If any one claimed anything as his own, he was shut out from association with the others and punished by penances. No one dared to return evil for evil, or to let fall a harsh word; so that people must have believed that an angelic life was being lived by mortal men. The holy man was revered with so great gratitude that where he remained for a time in a house, all hearts were resolved to practice the faith more strictly."

These seemingly harmless statements, while they are true and are borne out by the "*Regula*" and the "*Poenitentiale*" of Columbanus, as well as by his "*Instructiones*," are in reality a formal requisitory against the episcopate and clergy of Gaul. They breathe the fearless Keltic spirit of the "*Epistola*" of Gildas to the King of Britain—for that matter, the spirit of St. Patrick's famous letter to the chieftain Coroticus. Only, the form is gentler and more persuasive. This is the atmosphere of the "*Fioretti*," and through it we seem to see Francis and his first poor brethren, Egidio and Leone and the others, moving about in the hamlets and villages of Umbria. It is not the only point of contact between the "*Poverello di Cristo*" and the deeply mystical and romantic Columbanus.

Jonas does not tell through whose good offices Columbanus was

brought to the notice of King Childebert. We learn from the "Vita" of St. Agilus that it was his father, the nobleman Agnoaldus, who stood sponsor for these men of God and proved his confidence in them by abandoning to Columbanus this same Agilus, even as Benignus had been granted by his parents to Patrick.⁷ The experience of Wales and Armorica may have been one motive for the acquiescence of the missionaries, and the abandonment of their original design to "peregrinari pro Christo," not only in Gaul, but in "other lands," and even into Brandenburg and Pomerania, Bohemia and Moravia. Certainly at a later date Columbanus gives evidence of a weariness with the effort to elevate the ecclesiastical life of the Gallo-Roman communities. He begs to be forgotten, with the rest of his "Scoti," in the forests that they were then inhabiting for many years. Perhaps Agnoaldus moved him to accept the "counsel of the King." Perhaps the Queen-Mother Brunehilde, the real power in the Austrasian court, threw her influence in the balance. She was yet far away from the tragic temper of her closing years, though less gracious and lovely than when nearly thirty years before (566) this daughter of the Visigoths had come from Toledo to capture on her royal "progress" to Metz the heart of every Frank and to rule supremely over Sigibert until his death. We have yet the "Epithalamium" that the Italian priest, Venantius Fortunatus, composed for that brilliant wedding, and it brings back in a picturesque way how intermingled in this sixth-century Gaul are the last days of Roman life and literature and the first dawn of mediæval life. This Brunehilde whom a Ravennese chaplain of German nuns sang as Venus Anadyomene, as Queen of the Nereids and Mistress of all the Nymphs, was destined to chase these Irish missionaries out of Gaul, and to end her life in a manner that would have chilled the heart of any Greek or Roman, but was not out of keeping with the fierce temper of the new German lords of Europe. In her life and in that of her equally beautiful and equally fated but better sister Galeswintha, wife of the savage Chilperic of Neustria, are rooted all the poetry and passion, all the fondness and choler, all the romance and chivalry of the middle ages. There is in their story, whether we read it in the original and contemporary description of Gregory of Tours or in the inimitable "Récits des Temps Mérovingiens" of Augustin Thierry, a kind of Christian "replica" of the inexorable "Necessity" of the Greek tragedians, that divine jealousy which the pagan mind, from Herodotus down, believed to drive incessantly upon the rocks the bark of human life. So long ago began those dynastic relations between France and Spain out

⁷ "Vita Sancti Agili Abbatis Resbacensis," c. 1. (Mabillon, "Acta SS. Ord. S. Bened.," Vol. II.) He was called Agilus (Agilis) "propter celeres motus infantiae."

of whose vicissitudes the modern political world has grown to a greater extent than is usually known!

The result of the interview of Columbanus and his companions with King Childebert was a general permission to go where they would within the domains of Austrasia or Burgundy. The "quiet hermitage" that the King counseled they found in the heart of the Vosges.

"At that time," says Jonas (c. 12), "there was a great wilderness called Vogesus, in which there was a castle, which had long been in ruins and which had been called for ages Anagrates. When the holy man came to that place, he settled there with his followers, in spite of the entire loneliness, the wilderness and the rocks, mindful of the proverb that man shall not live by bread alone, but shall have sufficient food from the bread of life and shall never hunger."

To-day nothing is left of the Columban monastery at Annegrai save a rude stone wall, not unlike the ancient "cashels" of Ireland. It rose upon a knoll in the valley of the Breuchin, where the foothills come down to the plain, in the heart of a forest that has long since melted away. Wide plains are there now, with "long straight roads bordered with lines of tall poplars" such as one sees so often in rural France. To the northeast, however, rise yet the wooded Vosges. The forests of the Jura are still there as of old.

Whether Columbanus knew it or not, it was an Old-Keltic land, and the Sun-God of Ireland had once a vast primitive temple on those very hills of the Vosges.⁸ Before Columbanus, and before the Romans, the Druids of Gaul had here a famous centre and school. In these hills that bear yet in their nomenclature the memories of their Keltic period, took place the first conflicts between the encroaching Teutons and the ancient settlers of the land. The Gallo-Roman civilization had blotted out all the perishable monuments of this history, and itself in turn had fallen a prey to the ravages of Time. It was a lonely and rocky wilderness when our Irishmen took up their abode in its solemn depths. One of them was soon attacked by a violent fever. The place was doubtless malarial from neglect and darkness, but the sickness of their "brother" was looked on by them "as a test or because of some sin." So intense and simple was the faith in which they lived and worked! Doubtless, too, the sickness arose from the want of food, since they had only "the bark of trees and the roots of herbs" to sustain them. Even these they abstained from through three days' earnest prayer for the sick brother's welfare. Their wants were relieved by the sudden appearance of "a certain man standing before their gate with horses laden with a supply of bread and condiments. He said that he had been led by a sudden impulse of his heart to bear aid from his own

⁸ Edouard Schuré, "Les Grandes Légendes de France." Paris, 1892, c. I. "Les Légendes de l'Alsace."

substance to those who were, for Christ's sake, suffering from so great poverty in the wilderness." (c. 13.) He received from Columbanus and the brethren a solemn benediction that worked the recovery of his sick wife, then a year burning with a violent and incurable fever, perhaps an ague and chills.

They had scarcely recovered from their great weakness when they gave themselves over again to a period of nine days' fasting, perhaps a kind of novena. Jonas (c. 14) gives as a reason that they desired "to mortify their members to the glory of God and to preserve inviolate the state of their religion." The bitterness of this extreme fasting, again upon bark and roots, was tempered at last by the arrival of the "cellerarius" of a neighboring monastery named "Salicis," or The Willows. Its abbot, Caramtoc, had been warned in a dream of the plight of the Irishmen, and sent his good Marculf with wagons loaded with food. The way had been lost in the darkness, but there was an unknown road that the horses followed of their own accord. Marculf walked in their steps, and thus reached the man of God with the gifts of Caramtoc. The wilderness resounded with thanks to the Creator who had prepared a table for His servants in so miraculous a way. Marculf returned, rejoicing in their blessing, and soon made known what manner of men had come to the ruined burg of Annegrai. "Then crowds of people," says Jonas, "and throngs of the infirm began to crowd about St. Columbanus, in order that they might recover their health and in order to seek aid in all their infirmities. When he was unable to rid himself of their importunities, obeying the petitions and prayers of all, he healed the infirmities of all who came to him."

One of the most striking traits in the life of Columbanus is his fondness for absolute solitude, especially for some lonely cleft in the hills where he could commune with the Holy Spirit untroubled by the conversation of men or the cares of his community. We shall see this at Luxeuil and again at Bobbio. Columbanus, left to himself, is an ancient Father of the Desert. No doubt he had read the "*Vitæ Patrum*" and the writings of John Cassian so well that his spirit was now one with theirs. The "*Benchuir bona regula*" encouraged this temper, and he had himself known many a holy solitary in his Irish home. Some seven miles from Annegrai he found a suitable rocky hollow in an immense cliff, hanging sheer and inaccessible, deep in the forest, and away from all haunts of men. A bear had made a home for herself therein, but she was ordered away by the saint, and never dared to return again. It is not without reason that the bear recurs so often in the iconography of Columbanus; that wild beast seems particularly timid before this strong and handsome and holy man, not only at Annegrai, but at Luxeuil

and Bobbio. Water was, of course, the chief care of the saint in this lonely perch. How he secured an unfailing supply is told by Jonas (c. 16) in a way that leaves little to be desired, so vivid and impressionistic is the tale:

"At one time he was living alone in that hollow rock, separated from the society of others, and, as was his custom, dwelling in hidden places or more remotely in the wilderness, so that when the feasts of the Lord or saints' days came he might, with his mind wholly free from disquieting cares, devote himself to prayer, and might be ready for every religious thought. He was so attenuated by fasting that he scarcely seemed alive. Nor did he eat anything except a small measure of the herbs of the field, or of the little apples which that wilderness produces and which are commonly called *bolluca*. His drink was water. And as he was always occupied with other cares he could not get this regularly, at least during the time he was performing his vows. A little boy named Domoalis (Donald) was in his service. This boy went alone to tell the father when certain events happened at the monastery and to carry back his directions to them. When this boy had remained for several days in the hollow of the rock, which was difficult of approach from all directions, he began to complain because he could not get water quickly. It tired his knees to bring it with so great labor through the difficult mountain paths. Columban said to him: 'My son, get to work; make a little hole in the back of the rock. Remember, the Lord produced streams of water from a rock for the people of Israel.' He obeyed and attempted to make a hole in the rock. The holy man immediately fell upon his knees and prayed to God that He would aid him in his need. At length his prayers were heard; great power came to him piously praying. And soon the fountain of water began to flow regularly, and it remains to this day."

Like all the old Irish saints, he was fond of the deep woods and willingly spent whole days in them. He was fond, too, of fishing, and the calm bookish ease of the riverside.* In Jonas we have vivid snapshots, as it were, of his great tall frame seated on a fallen oak reading a book, and again plying the axe with the brethren on the hills above Bobbio and shouldering with them the heavy logs that were destined for the monastery. Sometimes he seems to have got lost in ecstatic joy amid these monarchs of the forest. Psychologically one of the most instructive chapters in Jonas (c. 15) brings the saint before us during a sojourn in the heart of some great forest of the Vosges:

"While the holy man was wandering through the dark woods, and was carrying on his shoulder a book of the Holy Scripture, he happened to be meditating. And suddenly the thought came into his mind which he would prefer to suffer—injuries from men or to be exposed to the rage of wild beasts. While he thought earnestly, frequently signing his forehead with the sign of the cross and praying, he decided that it was better to suffer from the ferocity of wild beasts, without any sin on their part, than from the madness of men who would lose their souls. And while he was turning this over in his mind he perceived twelve wolves approaching and standing on the right and on the left, while he was in the middle. He stood still and said: 'Oh, God, come to my aid; oh, Lord, hasten to aid me.' They came nearer and seized his clothing. As he stood firm they left him unterrified and wandered off into the woods. Having passed through the temptation in safety, he continued his course through the woods. And before he had gone far he heard the voices of many Suevi wandering in the hidden paths. At this time they were robbing in those places. And so at length by his firmness having dismissed the temptation he escaped the misfortune. But he did not know clearly whether this scene was some of the Devil's deceit or whether it actually happened."

Soon the original settlement in the vale of Annegrai proved unsuitable. Jonas gives as a reason for its abandonment the increase in the number of monks—he does not say how long the "Scoti" stayed at Annegrai. They would need, after the manner of Bangor

*"Redeamus ad librum," he says to Boniface IV., "quem juxta ripam dimisimus." Migne PL., LXXX., 278.

and other Irish monastic schools, a clear stream of water or good springs, a goodly space for their several little churches, their barns and storehouses, refectory, book-house and guest-house, also a space for a kiln and a mill. When novices or students multiplied, each would want his own small bee-hive cell. Thus a fairly large area was at once indispensable. Moreover, a church had to be built for lay visitors and for women—neither of these classes was ever allowed within the sacred precincts of the monastery itself. A typical trait is reported of good old Saint Senanus of Iniscathay (Scattery Island) how his motto read:

“Nullam sane feminam
Admittemus in insulam.”

The visitor to Bobbio may see yet in the ancient disposition of the town the size and style of an Old-Irish monastery. Columbanus was such a stickler for the ecclesiastical customs of Ireland—“*traditionum Scoticarum tenacissimus conscriptor*”—says an old manuscript of St. Gall, that he would scarcely depart from the consecrated style of his own school of Bangor. At Bobbio, the cathedral—formerly the people’s church in the days of monastic independence—is at a considerable distance from the abbey buildings, rather close to the broad and pebbly bed of the Trebbia.

“As the number of monks increased greatly,” says his genial biographer (c. 17), “he sought in the wilderness a better location for a convent. He found a place formerly strongly fortified, which was situated about eight miles from the first abode and which had formerly been called Luxovium.⁹ Here were baths constructed with unusual skill. A great number of stone idols which in the heathen times had been worshiped with terrible rites stood in the forest near at hand. Here then the excellent man began to build a monastery. At the news of this the people streamed in from all directions in order to consecrate themselves to the practice of religion, so that the large number of monks scarcely had sufficient room. The children of the nobles from all directions strove to come thither; despising the spurned trappings of the world and the present pomp of wealth, they sought eternal rewards. Columbanus perceived that the people were rushing in from all directions to the remedy of penance and that the walls of one monastery could with difficulty hold so great a throng of converts. Although they were of one purpose and heart, yet one monastery was insufficient for the abode of so great a number. Accordingly, he sought out another spot especially remarkable for its bountiful supply of water and founded a second convent, which he gave the name of Fontanas. In this he placed men whose piety could not be doubted. After he had settled the bands of monks in these places he stayed alternately at the two convents, and full of the Holy Ghost he established the rule which they were to follow. From this rule the prudent reader or listener may learn the extent and character of the holy man’s learning.”

⁹ *Invenirent locum muris antiquis septum calidis aquis rigatum, sed jam vetustate collapsum, qui vulgo Luxovium vocabatur. Ibi oratorium in honore beati Petri constituentes, mansiunculas in quibus commanerent fecerunt.* “Acta SS. Boll,” October 16.

Perhaps as they gazed on the relics of Roman majesty they felt some such thrill as roused the soul of the old Anglo-Saxon poet in the “Ruined Burg,” when he gazed on the ruins of Rome’s authority in Britain:

Wondrous is this wall of stone; weirds have shattered it!
Broken are the burg-steads, crumbled down the giant’s work!
Fallen are the roof-beams, ruined are the towers:
All undone the door-pierced turrets; frozen dew is on their plaster.
Shorn away and sunken down are the sheltering battlements,
Under-eaten of Old Age! Earth is holding in her clutch
These the power-wielding workers; all forworn and all forlorn in death are they,
Hard is the grip of the ground; while a hundred generations
Move away.
—“The Ruined Burg” in Stopford Brooke, *op. cit.*, p. 86.

Of the monastery of Fontaines nothing remains now except the general aspect of the place and the surrounding scenery. A graceful Gothic church lends charm and dignity to the pretty village of Fontaines that stands on a little hill in the canton of Saint Loup, above the river Roge. "This first priory in France," says its historian, De Beausejour, "now sleeps its last sleep on the bank of that same river which saw its first walls arise and has ever since witnessed all the changes of its fortune." In the village church is a stained glass window that represents Columbanus draining the marshes that were made by the numerous springs of the district. Fontaines is reached from Luxeuil by a road that passes through noble forests of oak, fir and elm, relieved by patches of silvery birch and aspen. The whole vicinity abounds in local memories of the Old-Irish missionaries who reclaimed these abandoned lands and made them among the loveliest of all France. A late traveler describes the cave of Saint Walbert, a local successor of Columbanus, and himself a wooer of solitude like his master in religion :

"Passing the village (of Luxeuil) and descending into one of these wooded dells, in about a quarter of an hour we reached the hermitage, consisting of a tiny chapel, like a little rectangular tower, a subterranean chapel excavated in the rock and a cave formed partly by nature, partly by art, hollowed out of huge blocks of sandstone, within which is the saint's well. The exquisitely clear, cool water streams forth from the jaws of a grotesque antique head, some long-forgotten river god, and falls into a great stone reservoir. On looking further into the depths of the cavern I saw worn antique statues, in their priestly robes, piled up against these huge Cyclopean walls, strange relics of some long-abandoned cult. And at a height upon the face of the cliff above me there was a rude impassioned figure of the saint in prayer carved on an upper stratum of the rock: that Christian hermit who had turned the fountain into a holy well. This group of symbols of successive worship, thus thrown together in this wild forest cave, was one of the most impressive things I have ever seen."

Doubtless we have here yet some of the "stone idols worshiped with horrible rites" that Jonas saw with his own eyes at Luxeuil, last relics of the local worship of the old Keltic shepherd-god, the gigantic Vogesus of these mountains, of Rhenus, Esus, Tarann and Belen. Paganism was not yet utterly extinct in Ireland, and it may be that Columbanus and his Irishmen recognized some of these local deities as close kin to those of the Irish Pantheon, so nobly described by Samuel Ferguson in his great epic "*Congal*."

None of the three original Columban monasteries in Gaul attained the celebrity of Luxeuil. It became the centre and source of all the later Scotie influence. An ancient "*Vita Sancti Galli*" says that the church of the abbey was dedicated to God in honor of Saint Peter. The altar was consecrated by a holy Bishop named Aidus, perhaps one of his own band, and a tradition has always lingered on that it was built over the débris of a temple of Diana. It was probably a small church, perhaps of wood and painted, after the Irish fashion—Columbanus himself calls it an *altare*¹⁰, and the very old "*Life of St.*

¹⁰ Letter of Saint Columbanus ad discipulos et monachos suos: "*Altare quod*

Gall" says it was an *oratorium*. Almost at once it enjoyed, in a special way, the right of sanctuary and the protection of the royal authority. In the eighth century the Saracens destroyed the new church built on the same site (715-720) and massacred the monks (c. 732). The Chronicle of Fontanelles tells us that Abbat Ansegisus rebuilt the church in 817, and that Louis the Pious endowed it. A painter named Madalulf decorated with frescoes the walls of the refectories and dormitories.

In 888 the Northmen repeated the evil deeds of the Saracens, though the church was left standing. When the monastery of Luxeuil was rebuilt, in 1049, the church was remodeled and enlarged. Early in the thirteenth century (1201) the monastery and church were burned to the ground, and with them went most of the ancient papers of Luxeuil—titles, privileges, charters, archives and perhaps old relics of the Columban period. The present church is the one that was shortly afterward rebuilt on the ancient site. The monastery, built at the same time, did not outlast the seventeenth century. An ancient lighthouse, "*Pharus quam Lucernam vocant*," existed near the church in the time of Mabillon, "*in gratiam eorum qui noctu ecclesiam frequentabant*," a kind of Round Tower; but it has long since disappeared. Miss Stokes describes the interior of the church as "very solemn and impressive," essentially monastic for the deep choir, lofty and vast, bearing abundant traces of the original Romanesque architecture, here and there overlaid or cast out by the Pointed Gothic of the fourteenth century, when the final touches were put to it by Abbat Odo de Charenton (1330) in the midst of an enthusiasm so general that every servant of the abbey took a part in the great work. Its lovely stained glass windows are the only fit monument that now remains to the honor of Columbanus—most of them consecrate the best known scenes in the Life by Jonas. Curious to behold are Saint Lua following Columbanus out of Ireland, Deicola receiving the Pope's bull or diploma, and Gall in the depths of the forest. There, too, are the wolves about Columbanus, and the birds nestling in the hood of the younger Columbanus, that he had put aside while working. A very ancient statue of St. Peter used as a target for boys since the Revolution is now (since 1875) properly housed. During the French Revolution the village mob sacked the church and its sacristies. Numberless relics of Columbanus and his immediate successors, Eustasius and Walbert, were destroyed or taken away—silver armshrines, reliquaries, crystals, a silver statuette of the saint, rings, enameled crosses,

sanctus Aidus episcopus benedixit" (Migne PL., LXXX., col. 271). Perhaps he is speaking of a portable altar consecrated in Ireland. This could scarcely have been the Aidan of Bede (III., 5), for he was not consecrated a bishop until about 635. The context seems to imply a certain special sanctity of the altar.

chalices and the like.¹¹ Only the spotted wooden bowl of St. Walbert—one of the well-known “mazers” or drinking cups of the Irish monks, is yet preserved in the Séminaire that adjoins the church. A similar one that belonged to Columbanus himself is still kept at Bobbio, likewise his knife, and the veneration of these curious remnants of his life is vouched for since fully a thousand years. In the Louvre may yet be seen a splendid mediæval crozier found at Luxeuil in 1862. Some of the very old manuscripts of Luxeuil are in the British Museum, others at the Bibliothèque Nationale, others again are yet in private hands.¹²

Just outside the town stands still the parish church of Saint Sauveur, with its old legend contemporary of Columbanus. It is said by Jonas that when the monastery of Luxeuil was building a parish priest named Winnoc, whose son was Bobolenus, the abbat of Bobbio in the time of Jonas, was hurt by a wedge that flew from one of the great logs that the monks were splitting and was miraculously cured by Columbanus. This same Winnoc was deeply attached to Columbanus and followed him wherever he went about the monastery grounds, being once a witness of the miraculous multiplication of the bread in the storehouse, after he had chided the saint for his slothfulness in getting food for the monks (cc. 24, 28). Another legend is that Winnoc came mysteriously out of the forest and administered the Eucharist to Columbanus, and then returned to the

¹¹ The destruction of the library of Luxeuil Abbey was the most mournful episode in the history of the town. In the year 1798 the suppression of convents was the order of the day. The effect of the great revolutionary movement of the 14th of July was felt all through France. At Luxeuil the people rose *en masse* and collected at the side of the town which is washed by the river Breuchin and scaled the barricades in a moment. The monks, who had trusted little to the townsmen for protection, had already taken flight. The peasants, pouring into the abbey, whose gates were open, first rushed upstairs to the library, persuaded that the books were title-deeds. They threw them in numbers from the window into the gardens below, where they made a bonfire of them. Others were torn up and used to ram the guns of the army of Sambre and Meuse. Thus disappeared among other precious works the “Chronicon Luxoviense,” the manuscript treatises of Addo and the collection of ancient ceremonials used by Mabillon in his “History of the Gallican Liturgy.” Miss Stokes, “Three Months in the Forests of France.” London, 1895, pp. 67-68.

¹² The general impression of modern Luxeuil is feelingly sketched by Miss Stokes in her useful book: “The dim, quiet, low-roofed aisles flanking the majestic nave, the double ranges of columns that support the vault whence its arches spring, the lofty transepts and the subdued warm light, varied by the color of the stained glass windows, all combine to awaken the sense of devotion and mystery. And the same may be said of all connected with the church; the same exquisite taste and perfect repose seem to characterize the services and, to my foreign eye, to set it on a different level from most continental churches. Never shall I forget the evening weekly services, commencing at eight o’clock, during the month of my stay here, when the music had a character peculiarly its own, when the choir, mainly of female voices, sang their hymns to native melodies, old religious French *cantiques*, sweet, simple airs, with the true ring in them below the graceful surface. Night after night the church was filled, and when the crowds poured forth into the quiet moonlit streets, and friend met friend and sauntered home through the Gothic cloisters and beneath the ancient walls and carved balconies of the Hotel de Ville and the Maison Jouffroi or lingered in the arcades of the Maison François I., I could not but feel that to the poor citizens of Luxeuil this house of prayer was also a house of rest and refreshment for body and for soul.” *Op. cit.*, pp. 69-70.

forest, never more to be seen. Curiously enough such another mysterious pioneer hermit, the holy Lintan, appears at Bobbio, and is mentioned in the diploma of Agilulf, together with the famous "medietas putei" that still exists at Bobbio as thirteen hundred years ago. Until the Revolution Saint Sauveur was the parish church of Luxeuil; in all probability it was the people's church from the beginning, like the cathedral of Bobbio.

In the "Life" of Saint Valéry (Walaricus), the shepherd boy whom Columbanus used playfully to call the "lord and abbat" of Luxeuil,¹³ it is said that two hundred and twenty monks lived in the three monasteries. That they were very numerous is clear from the assertion of Jonas (c. 28) that one day at Fontaines sixty of them were "hoeing in the fields and breaking up the clods with great labor." Columbanus provided for their government by his famous "Regula Coenobialis" and his "Poenitentiale," two important documents that can be fully treated only in an account of the writings of Columbanus.¹⁴ The "Regula," be it said at once, was of Irish origin and character, and doubtless differed little from that of Bangor, which would yet be to him and his companions what it was when they first put on its yoke:

O Benchuir bona regula!
 Recta atque divina . . .
 Navis nunquam turbata,
 Quamvis fluctibus tonsa,
 Christo Regina apta,
 Solis luce amicta,
 Simplex simul atque docta,
 O Benchuir bona regula!

¹³ Valéry was the gardener of the convent at Luxeuil, and in the legend of his life we read that Columbanus held it as a mark of divine favor that no flowers smelt so sweet, no vegetables were so fresh, as those of his dear Valéry; and when the young gardener entered the hall where Columban was expounding the Holy Scripture, he carried with him so strong a perfume of his flowers that the air of the lecture-room was filled with it, and Columban exclaimed in delight: "It is thou, beloved, who art the lord and abbat of this monastery!" When the brethren visited Valéry in his cell they found him feeding little flocks of birds, who warbled through his flowers or fed from his hand. And when the swallows flew away in fright he would motion with his hand to the monks to keep them off, saying: "My brethren, do not frighten my little friends or do them any harm; rather let them satisfy their hunger with our crumbs." Miss Stokes, op. cit., p. 74.

¹⁴ The "Poenitentiale" of Saint Columbanus is a kind of directory for monastic confessors, with exactly measured "penances" to be imposed for various sins. The range of sins that are visited with penances is considerably wider than in the old penitential system of the continent. Sins of thought are also considered and appropriate penances allotted to them. Here for the first time a minute immediate direction of consciences appears in written documents of an ecclesiastical character. There are other "Poenentialia"—perhaps the oldest is that of Vinianus (Finnian), that Columbanus seems to have known and used. It is thought by many that these "Poenentialia" were first used in Ireland, where a monastically governed people would easily, if gradually, accept the penitential discipline of their own monks. Through the numerous Scotie missionaries like Columbanus they got a gradual adoption among the Franks, and so the *praxis* at least of sacramental confession was gradually modified from what it was in the fourth and fifth centuries to the mediæval method. Bishop Schmitz maintained against Wasserscheleben that before Columbanus a similar "Poenentiale" of Roman origin has made its way among the Franks and was actually in use. Cf. "Wasserscheleben, Die Bussordnungen der abendländischen Kirche," 1851 (2d edition). Schmitz, "Die

Precepts for the perfect monastic life make up the first part of the Rule. They are couched in the spirit of all older monastic rules. Only they breathe a very intense earnestness and their expression is tinged with something of that high Keltic ardor and passion that never brooks a middle way. The Gallo-Romans, Martin, Cassian, Cæsarius, could not have signed these paragraphs without hesitation. In no previous monastic institution does the personal element retreat so into the background as in this "Regula." Even the "obedientia baculina" comes out in it; the monk lives no longer—another lives in him, though he believes that it is the Divine Master who acts in the person of "abbat" or "senior." While the Columban Rule did not long outlive the death of its author as the working constitution of the monasteries that soon rose by hundreds all over Central and Western Europe, its influence remained, borne along for centuries by the moral prestige of the great Irishman, by the stern and high Christian idealism that breathed through every paragraph of its text, by the numberless foundations that went out, immediately and mediately, from Luxeuil and Bobbio, by the romantic interest that attached to the person of its author, and by the great multitude of holy men that it formed in a very short while. In its own cradle, at Luxeuil, and Bobbio, it gave way, strangely soon, to the Rule of Saint Benedict. This was partly because these monasteries did not long remain solely Scotie, but took in monks from the vicinity—Franks and Lombards and others; partly because there was in the Rule of Saint Benedict more moderation of tone, more gentleness of spirit, more willingness to wait for perfection, more readiness to acknowledge an ineradicable element of personality than were to be found in the precepts of a man who had learned his Christianity not at Rome, but at Bangor; not in a society that was wise with much experience of Christian mankind, but in one that as yet lay almost outside the ken of the civilized European world, a fact that Columbanus himself admits in his letter to Gregory the Great.

The second part of the Rule, that deals with the sanctions for its violations, is unique among ecclesiastical documents for its awful severity. Corporal punishment is dealt out with a generous hand for the slightest infraction of discipline—at table, at the altar, at prayers, in any of the meanest or most ordinary actions of the day. It alternates with solitary confinement and a minimum of nourishment. The sign of the cross was commanded for a multitude of daily acts—an ancient monastic custom, indeed—but enforced by Columbanus

Bussbücher und die Bussdisciplin der Kirche," 2 vols., 1883, 1900. Boudinhon, "Revue d'histoire littéraire et religieuse," Vol. II., pp. 306, 496. Hauck, "Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands," Part I., pp. 252-257. Hauck is of opinion that there is no good reason for denying to our saint the authorship of the "Poenitentiale" that goes by his name; if not written by his hand, it was written at Luxeuil by one of his Irish disciples.

with the severest penalties. Each brother, at every going out and coming in, must go before the abbat or "senior" and get his blessing. At his first word every monk must stand with uncovered head. Whoever cut the table with his knife, or spilled the beer, or let the food drop on the floor, or did not carefully gather up the crumbs, or failed to bow his head at the end of each psalm, or disturbed the psalmody with coughing and spitting, was made to feel on his back the gravity of his sin. A blind and absolute obedience was demanded of all; they were as children beneath the eye of a father and they must learn from one another the great virtues of the monk's life—obedience, humility, contemplative silence, control of all impulsiveness—above all, that mortification, that thorough deadening of one's own will which is for the monk the first indispensable step in the way of perfection. Once a day, at eventide, enough food was given to each one to sustain his strength—usually vegetables, cakes rudely cooked, perhaps after the Irish fashion, a little baked bread. On certain occasions fish and beer were allowed. Poultry and beef and other ordinary meats, likewise delicate dishes of any kind, were forbidden. "Man liveth not by bread alone" was their constant thought. If the "*Instructiones ad monachos*" usually attributed to Columbanus are really his, and there is no good reason to abjudicate them from him, he was wont to liken the soul of the monk to one of the monastery fields. Pride and avarice and envy were as the boulders and roots that must be broken up and cast away. The cold hard soil of the natural worldly soul must be torn again and again with harrow and plough, that the weeds and thorns of a low, selfish life may be destroyed, and the seeds of virtue be planted that will one day ripen into a celestial harvest.

Of course these ideas were not new; nor were grave and holy persons so rare on the continent, even in the Frankish churches, that models of the Christian virtues were unknown before Columbanus. But he brought to his task of a moral reformation in Gaul an astounding energy, a quickness and thoroughness of resolution, a simplicity and certainty of means, a daring leadership in his own person that recalled at once the great Christian patriarchs of the Orient, whose lives were household words in Gaul through the reports of pilgrims, the writings of Cassian and the popular legends that had grown up about their names. He was known to be brave to a fault in the presence of the boldest and most powerful; this did not hurt him in a society just founded by the sword and the spear. He sought neither wealth nor station; this helped him among men who were being scandalized at the general hunt, even among clerics, for more land and more power. He had just come over from Ireland, already the "*Insula Sanctorum et Doctorum*," then in the full swing of the mon-

astic movement, its whole people governed by monks and cherishing no other ideals than those of the Old and the New Testament, as preached at Armagh and Clonmacnoise, at Bangor and at Glendalough. Columbanus and his companions were among the last of the "Second Order" of Irish saints,¹⁵ and their almost absolute imitation of the apostolic poverty and disinterestedness of the Patrician period was the very best argument for the heterogeneous society that they had entered.

It would take a large volume to relate properly the rapid diffusion of the Columban monasteries from the parent stem. Hauck follows it out in great detail (op. cit., pp. 271-293). Granval, St. Ursicin and Pfermund were the first "filial" monasteries of Luxeuil. But in the course of a century there sprang up a countless series of them, each one hiving many others. Not only Burgundy, but Normandy, the Rhineland, Lorraine, all Northern France, Switzerland in every direction, Southern Germany, came within the charmed circle of the Columban influence. From Bobbio, as from another pole, the same influence radiated through all Northern Italy, so that within the

¹⁵ It will be of interest to read the curious and very ancient account of the primitive clergy of Ireland that Usher first printed in his "Brit. Eccl." (p. 473). I take it from Stuart's "Armagh" (ed. Coleman, 1900), p. 18.

"The First Order of Catholic Saints was established in the time of Saint Patrick. The members of this order were all bishops, illustrious, pure, filled with the Holy Spirit, in number 350, and the founders of many churches. They had one head, Christ; one leader, Patrick; one Mass, one form of celebration, one tonsure, from ear to ear. They celebrated one Pasch, the fourteenth of the moon after the vernal equinox, and whatever was excommunicated or anathematized by one Church, all the others also excommunicated. They did not reject the aid and company of women, because being founded on the rock of Christ they feared not the wind of temptation. This order flourished during four reigns, viz., those of Leogaire, Ailill Molt, Lugad the son of Leogaire, and Tuathal. All these bishops were sprung from Romans, Franks, Britons and Scots, i. e., Hibernians (A. D. 432-544).

"They were succeeded by a 'Second Order of Catholic Priests.' In this were few bishops, but many presbyters, in number 300. They had one head, the Lord. They celebrated various Masses and adopted various rules. They kept one Pasch, the fourteenth day of the moon after the equinox; had one tonsure from ear to ear, refused the assistance of women and separated them from the monasteries. This order continued during four reigns, viz., from the end of the reign of Tuathal through the entire reigns of Diarmot and of the two grandsons of Muiredach, as well as that of Aid, the son of Ainmer. They received the Mass from Bishop David, Gilla and Docus, Britons (David, Gildas and Cadoc?). Of this class were the two Finians, the two Brendans, Jarlath of Tuam, Comgall, Coemgenus, Columba, Caineus (A. D. 544-598).

"The Third Order of saints was composed of holy priests and a few bishops, in number 100. These inhabited desert places, living on herbs, water and alms. They had no private property, and they had various rules, Masses and tonsure. Some had their hair shaven in form of a crown, others suffered it to remain in a bushy tuft. They varied as to the celebration of the Pasch, some holding it on the fourteenth, others on the sixteenth day of the moon, with great strictness. These continued during four reigns, etc. (A. D. 598-664).

"The First Order was styled *Sanctissimus*; the Second, *Sanctior*; the Third, *Sanctus*. The First is said to have been resplendent as the sun, the Second as the moon, the Third as the stars."

It is needless to add that the "aid and company of women" that the First Order did not reject was their service of the altars and the churches, and their free presence among the ecclesiastical ministers, all of which the "Second Order" severely prohibited. This ancient document, quite in keeping with the temper and spirit of the time, as the contemporary hagiography proves, is an excellent illustration of the exclusion of women by the Scotie missionaries from their monasteries on the continent.

triangle formed by Metz, Milan and Salzburg, Saint Columbanus and the spirit of his Rule were for two centuries the friendly rivals of Saint Benedict. Numerous bishops of France were educated at Luxeuil. Men abandoned the great monastic schools of Southern France, like Lérins, to read the Scriptures at Luxeuil among its "men of God." Great Frank nobles like Autharius and Hagnerich and Gundoin gave up their children to be its monks. Soon the best blood of the Frankish State was to be found in an assembly of Columban abbats. Eustasius and Waldebert, the first successors of Columbanus at Luxeuil, were most distinguished men. St. Eloi (Eligius), statesman, preacher, artist, was a Columban monk, or at least a student at Luxeuil. Arnulf of Metz, the contemporary of our saint and progenitor of the great mediæval Karlings, was the close friend and later the monastic companion of Romarich, a monk of Luxeuil and founder of the great French abbey of Remiremont. Luxeuil is mentioned in many Merovingian charters of the seventh and eighth centuries as the model of new monasteries; and if more than one foundation bore later the two names of Benedict and Columbanus, the latter was the original and sole "*trames religionis sanctissimorum virorum Luxoviensis monasterii*" that the Merovingian king put into his diploma. The abbat of Luxeuil had a general supervision over monasteries very remote from his own house. From all over Central Europe scholars were sent thither as to a "university" of piety, "*spiritualis profectus gratia*," or "*eruditionis gratia*," as it is written in the lives of early mediæval saints.¹⁶ In a special manner royal youths frequented Luxeuil. It must have been thence that the terrible Mayor Grimoald got the idea (656) of banishing into Ireland for eighteen long years the youthful Dagobert II., son of Sigibert III. of Austrasia, after cutting off his long hair. The Columban monk, Audoen of Rouen, the friend of St. Eloi, drew to Columban monasteries such men as the noble Wandregesilus, a relative of the house of Pepin and founder of Fontanelles. His biography is one of the most interesting of the Middle Ages, and in it one sees how the Irish element in the Columban monasteries was long prominent, even a hundred years after the death of the founder; for Wandregesilus is at one time moved to enter the monastery of Bobbio, and again he will go to Ireland to be a monk. It is the

¹⁶ So in the "Life" of Saint Frodobert: "*Erat eo tempore (under Waldebert) Luxoviense coenobium in Gallicis regionibus pene singulare tam in religionis apice quam etiam in perfectione doctrinae. Qua ex causa plurimi quibus in utramque partem proficiendi fervor inerat ad eundem locum certantibus studiis undique confluebant*" (c. 5). And in the "Life" of Saint Bercharius: "*Erat eo tempore in cunctis Galliarum partibus hoc coenobium in multimodis rerum possessionibus tum etiam divinae venerationis cultibus nomen singulare habens, quod illic et districtior institutio et studium sapientiae plenius haberetur*." One sees how the piety and learning of Luxeuil had become proverbial in the ninth century, to which many of these lives belong, either as originals or as worked-over and re-vamped editions of earlier "lives" that had long lost their savor or their charm.

Scotic monachism that fascinates him. Indeed, for long centuries there lingers on in the France and Germany of the Franks a profound veneration for the Irish monk. In his perfection he is, like Columbanus, a "reclusus," and such Irish "reclusi" are frequently mentioned so late as the eleventh century as an honor to various churches in Germany. Charlemagne himself was very fond of the "fratres" at Saint Gall: sometimes he borrowed their books and failed to return them. But even that did not strain their friendship; to the end he was "noster Carolus" for everybody in the great establishment that had grown up about the little bee-hive cell of Gallus. All the curious data about Irish monks and scholars in later mediæval Germany are intimately related to this first period of their career. The little "Schottenklöster" of the eleventh and twelfth centuries that yet hang on to life in the survival at Ratisbon, and in the "Schottenkirche" at Vienna, were no more than an expression of gratitude for the benefits of moral discipline, if not faith, that Christian Scotia once conferred upon their Frankish ancestors. The mediæval German hagiographers who rewrote or improved the original lives of the chief men of the Columban monasteries are also an evidence of the long-enduring veneration for their work.

There remains, to round out this summary sketch of Columbanus at Luxeuil the question of his relations with the local bishop and the episcopate in general. Hauck accuses him of overriding the authority of the Bishop of Besançon, to whose diocese Luxeuil belonged, by establishing monasteries without his permission and by having the altar at Luxeuil consecrated by an Irish bishop. But there is no direct evidence of his having neglected to obtain permission to settle at Annegrai. Jonas says that this was done with the good will of the "King and the Court"—in all probability the local bishop was too glad that the "bona derelicta" of the wilderness should be sanctified by such good men. As to the altar, Columbanus himself does say that it was one consecrated by "Sanctus Aidus episcopus." It may be here a question of a portable altar brought from Ireland and consecrated there long before by a "Sanctus Aidus." The Irish of those days were, perhaps inordinately fond of all the personal belongings of their saints, and carried about with them and handed down their chalices and staves, their bells and cloaks and books—such an altar would be an heirloom indeed for the pious Columbanus.

The case is otherwise with the episcopate of Gaul. We may with justice distinguish two epochs in the dealings of Columbanus with them, and also two lines of disagreement. In the first epoch he was surely moved by what seemed to him the moral laxity of the people in general, and he surely laid the responsibility at the door of the

Gallic bishops. As head of a band of wandering missionaries his philippics would naturally disturb the regular administration of the churches, all the more as Columbanus belonged to a church in which the bishop's office was usually subordinate to the monastic office, the bishop being often only one of the brethren who acknowledged the abbat as their head. But when he had settled at Luxeuil this cause of complaint could no longer exist. Similarly, in the beginning, he certainly desired to see the Keltic calculation of Easter imposed upon the churches of Gaul, but in the end he was content to keep this and other peculiarities of the Scotie churches for himself and his brethren. His fine ascetic temper was conditioned by the fact that there were no cities in his Ireland, and no moral problems such as civilization of the municipal character brings with it—above all, there was no political and social revolution like that which had affected the Gaul of the sixth century. His personal relations must have eventually been less strained, for we learn from him that many bishops chose him as their confessor; among the numerous friends of his dear Luxeuil were very many Frankish bishops.¹⁷

In the fourth Synod of Orleans (541) the Frankish bishops had decided that Easter must be celebrated according to the corrected cycle of Victorius. The Irish churches knew nothing of those fifth century Roman modifications that had taken place after the arrival among them of Saint Patrick (432). For them the ancient cycle of the Alexandrine Anatolius, that "*mirae doctrinae vir*," and the authority of the great Saint Jerome were scarcely needed to corroborate the practice of their own beloved and trusted Patrick, Bridget and Columba. We have a very bold and earnest letter of Columbanus to the Frankish Bishops in which he passionately defends the Scotie Easter. In it are already the distinguishing traits of Irish eloquence—abundance, ardor, picturesqueness—in whatever language it be poured forth. The letter was written in the twelfth year after his arrival in the Vosges. It may therefore be attributed to the year 596 or 597, though, perhaps, it was written a few years later. The weakest point of our saint's history is a chronology of his life. Columbanus was an intensely Scotie man all his life. There is in his epistles much ill-suppressed expression of his feeling that "all the churches of the West," *i. e.*, Ireland, Scotland and British England, were morally superior to those of the continent. Their ecclesiastical learning, too, he thought was superior to that of the Romans.¹⁸ And

¹⁷ Jonas, in "*Vita Eustasii*," c. 4. Abellenus vero vel ceteri Galliarum episcopi post ad roboranda Columbanus instituta adspirant. Quam multi jam in amore Columbanus et ejus regule monasteria construunt, plebes adunant, gregem Christi congregant!

¹⁸ Scias namque nostris magistris et Hibernicis antiquis philosophis et sapientissimis componendi calculi computariis Victorium non fuisse receptum, sed magis risu vel venia dignum quam auctoritate. Ep. I., ad Greg. Magn. Migne PL., LXXX., col. 261.

the manner in which his schools of Luxeuil and Bobbio were patronized might easily have justified this opinion. The bishops had surely not waited for twelve years to call a halt on the Columban Easter at Luxeuil. Among the remnants of his correspondence we have a letter of the saint to Gregory the Great that must have been written before the end of 595 and before the letter of Columbanus to the bishops. This letter shows that he had been previously called to account for his divergent celebration of Easter. Indeed, he says to the Pope that three years before, perhaps in 592, he had written to the bishops the "tomus responsionis meae" that he now sends to Rome, and in which he shows that "omnes ecclesiae totius Occidentis," *i. e.*, the insular Keltic churches, are on the side of the monks of Luxeuil. He wonders that at Rome the "ancient error" of Gaul¹⁹ has not long since been corrected and calls on the Pope to condemn Victorius with the Irish or renounce the "fides" and the "auctoritas" of Saint Jerome.²⁰ He adds "tres tomos" of an historico-theological disquisition, in which the Pope can see what the Scotie churches think on the subject. The boldness of his speech, both to Gregory the Great and to Boniface IV., does not prevent him from acknowledging their authority and invoking it—in his own favor, of course. The bishops now invited him to the Synod of Sens in 601, but he refused to attend it, persuaded that they would expel him from the "locus deserti quem pro Domino meo Jesu Christo de transmare expetivi" if he did not give up the Scotie Easter. There is no proof of their intention to do this. But the letter of refusal to attend the Synod is marked by a change of attitude. Henceforth he makes no claim to impose his Easter on the churches of Gaul—he only asks that they do not impose their Easter on the monks of Luxeuil.²¹ In other words, he pleads now for peace and tolerance as he had before pleaded for absolute unanimity on lines laid down by himself. He had learned that it was impossible to impose on all Gaul the "mores" of Bangor as easily as he had established them in the "desert" of the Vosges, and with the quick decision proper to the

¹⁹ Ep. I., ad Greg. Magn. "Miror . . . fateor, a te hunc Galliae errorem . . . jam diu non fuisse rasum." Saint Gregory also alleged the antiquity of the Roman custom, but (ibid) Columbanus replied: "Temporis antiquitate roborata mutari non posse, manifeste antiquus error est," forgetting that the principle could be turned against himself. Migne, op. cit., ibid.

²⁰ Simpliciter enim ego tibi confiteor quod contra S. Hieronymi auctoritatem veniens apud Occidentis ecclesias (*i. e.*, the Scotie) hereticus seu respuendus erit: illi enim per omnia indubitata in scripturis divinis accomodant fidem. Ep. I., ad Greg. Magn. Op. cit., col. 262.

²¹ Quia hujus diversitatis auctor non sim ac pro Christo salvatore communi domino ac Deo in has terras peregrinus processerim, deprecor vos . . . ut mihi liceat in his silvis silere et vivere . . . sicut usque nunc licuit nobis inter vos vixisse. . . . Absit ut ego contra vos contendam congregiendum ut gaudeant inimici nostri (Arians, Bonosi, pagans) de nostra Christianorum contentione . . . cum pace et humilitate libri legantur utrique, et quae plus veteri et novo testamento concordant sine ullius invidia serventur. Ep. II., ad episcopos. Op. cit., col. 267.

man, he acted accordingly. After all, Columbanus was a moral reformer; it was of infinitely more importance to him that the children of the great Frank nobles should be sent to Luxeuil than that the Easter of Patrick and Bridget and Columba should replace that of Gaul and Rome. Yet, even in his defeat, one gathers an impression of "science" routed by "authority"—to the end the old "magister" of Bangor is a firm believer in the mathematics and church history of his Irish "seniores."

Would that every domestic dissension among Christians had been as quickly and gently ended! He continued to celebrate his Scotie Easter, perhaps not without some molestation, for his letter to Boniface IV., written some ten years after the Synod just mentioned, asks in humble terms that the Pope confirm to him and his the right to do so.²² Certainly his successors at Luxeuil and Bobbio did not keep up the Scotie Easter, though they clung with affection to the dear old Scotie "Regula" and to several of the customs that the Irish brethren had brought over. Just as the Latin manuscripts of these old Irishmen betray yet, in text or gloss, the "Scotica manus" and the Scotie spelling, so the life of the original Columban monasteries bore for a long time indelible traces of the strong personality and odd insular habits of the original founders.

The story of the expulsion of Columbanus from Luxeuil can scarcely be separated from his temporary sojourn in Switzerland and his departure thence for the Lombard court of Agilulf and Theodelinda to found the monastery of Bobbio. Indeed, it is the proper prelude to the story of that great deed. These three years, almost the last of a strenuous and agitated career, are full of movement and color. Gallo-Roman and Britonized Armorica, France, Germany, Switzerland, Italy—it is a large scene through which moves this

²² Ut nobis peregrinis laborantibus tuæ piæ sententiæ præstes solatium, quo si non contra fidem est, nostrarum traditionum robore seniorum, quo ritum Paschæ sicut accepimus a majoribus observare *per tuum possimus iudicium* in nostra peregrinatione. Ep. 1, ad Bonifacium papam. It is worth recalling here that an ancient tradition makes Columbanus go into Italy in the last five years of the sixth century, visit Rome like other "sancti" of the "Second Order" and found Bobbio. Moreover, Bobbio was the first European monastery to put itself under the Papal "protection," if the document that proves the fact be a genuine one. Thereby it inaugurated a new chapter in the history of monasteries that thenceforth tended more and more to escape from immediate episcopal control. Every student of Italian church history will remember the contest of four centuries that Bobbio maintained against its local diocesan, the Bishop of Tortona, and the curious "compositio" by which in the eleventh century a "temporary diocese" was established in the curious little burg. In Rossetti can yet be read the sorrowful plaints of the monks at the high-handed treatment dealt out to them by the local authorities, ecclesiastical and civil. In the Old-Lombard crypt of Columbanus at Bobbio, amid the remains of the holy "peregrini" of the seventh and eighth centuries, his stern but noble Scotie spirit seems yet to live. No visitor of Scotie race can stand before the tomb of the great Leinsterman in Bobbio and not be moved in his heart as he reflects how thoroughly Columbanus changed the current of ecclesiastical and profane life before he was laid to rest beneath the shadow of the mighty Apennines. *Proh dolor! "Quantum refert in quo quisque tempore vixerit!"*

wonderful "vir desideriorum," as it is his white-robed figure that sheds upon the religious and political circumstances of all these lands the strongest and purest light. Saint Columbanus did not differ in his faith or in the great principles of Christian discipline from the Catholic Christians of the continent, but he did differ from most of them in moral energy, in Christian consistency of life and belief, in closeness of personal union with the Divine Master, in keenness of insight into the essentials of Christian life and calling, in contempt of earthly things, a man at once antique-patriarchal and mediævally romantic. From the "rafters of Italy" the tall chieftainly figure of the Irishman looks down upon the Græco-Roman world in the last phases of its decadence and out upon those loose indisciplined hordes of "Wandering Nations," those turbulent Teutons and Slavs that are finally coalescing and taking root all over the Western provinces of imperial Rome that they had first depopulated and made desolate. If he is not the first preacher to them of the Christian faith, he is the first successful preacher of a Christian discipline of life, of that sublime morality whose pursuit is the true education of the Christian. He is the needed forerunner of Saint Benedict, and he richly deserves a special chapter in the history of every great continental church.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

The Catholic University, Washington, D. C.

MISSIONARY IDEALS, CHRISTIAN AND COMMERCIAL.

IN their original meaning the terms apostle and missionary are identical. The one is of Greek, the other of Latin origin, and they have both been adopted into all modern languages. The first is usually confined to the disciples sent directly by our Lord to carry His revelation to the human race, or to such of their successors as have been eminent in history in the discharge of that work of the first apostles. The term missionary in common Catholic usage is applied to all others who devote themselves to bringing the doctrines of the Gospel to the knowledge and acceptance of the nations still outside the pale of the Church. The Christian Revelation is made for the whole human race, but in the Divine economy it was committed first to the Jews and through men of that nationality to the other races. Greek and Roman and Barbarian successively received the Christian faith and morality, and each in turn transmitted them

to remoter peoples. The work begun in Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost has been continued during nineteen centuries, and it still goes on in the same spirit and with the same objects. St. Patrick preaching to the Celtic Druids, Francis Xavier convincing the Japanese Bonzes and Brebœuf addressing the Iroquois sachems in the American forests, have repeated, in successive centuries, the task of St. Paul on the Athenian Areopagus. To men of their stamp Catholic practice has for centuries confined the title of missionaries.

The meaning which common usage among English-speaking nations attaches to the name at present is something quite different from the work of Xavier. The missionary interest is an important factor in the world of finance and politics which has little to do with the communication of any Divine Revelation to men. It embraces teachers of literature and science, doctors of medicine and farmers, ship owners and planters in its ranks, and it employs and pays them on commercial principles. The preachers of religion who form part of its members are sometimes zealous for particular doctrines, varying in kind in different stations, but as a general rule the formation of Christians is looked on as of secondary importance. The acquisition of lands and trade concessions, the collection of indemnities and the advancement of national material interests are the objects commonly associated in the public mind with the idea of "missionary work" to-day.

Nevertheless the work of converting the nations to Christ is still going on in every part of the globe on the principles and methods of St. Paul and St. Francis Xavier. The priests and others directly engaged in it in heathen lands number many thousands; the Christians won to the faith by them or their predecessors are counted by millions. It is true that financially the revenues of the Catholic missions are insignificant compared with those of the non-Catholic establishments. The Propagation of the Faith Association furnishes the largest part of the funds employed in Catholic mission work, and its annual collections seldom reach a million and a half dollars. The various Protestant bodies in this country alone boast of an annual revenue for mission purposes of no less than twenty-five millions. It is likely nearly as much more is raised in the British Empire. The financial resources of the non-Catholic missions are then nearly twenty fold greater than those at the disposal of Catholic missionaries. Judged by the mere number of converts actually existing in heathen lands, it is within strict truth to say that the results obtained by the latter are more than twenty fold greater. Moral results, after all, are very slightly dependent on the power of money or political predominance.

It is desirable, in the interests of truth, that the difference in object

and methods between Catholic and non-Catholic missions should be expressed by well recognized names. The task, however, is an impossible one for an individual. Common use gives the meaning of words at its discretion since the days of Horace. A hundred years ago when the term "missionary" was used it was almost identical with Catholic teacher. To-day it is the reverse, though the work of Brebœuf and Xavier still goes on under the old name. As the term "episcopal" is identified in common use with Anglican Protestantism, though episcopacy is the distinctive organization of the Catholic Church, so "missionary," when used without further qualification, has come in this country to mean the mixed secular and religious activity of Protestants in foreign lands. It is noteworthy that during the last three years it has scarcely ever been applied to the men who have formed the largest Christian population in the world outside European races. The Spanish priests of the Philippines are always the "friars," never "missionaries," in the American press, be its comments friendly or hostile.

If we cannot help the confusion of names we may at least clear up the difference in objects and methods between Catholic and non-Catholic missionaries by detailed description of both. This is the task we shall attempt here. A brief historical sketch appears the best course to illustrate the origin and development of each class of missions.

When, at the close of the fifteenth century, America and Asia were opened to Europe by Columbus and Da Gama the latter continent was almost wholly Christian. The Lithuanians, the last race to receive Christianity, had been converted many years before Columbus sailed from Palos. During the fifteenth century the work of bringing heathen races to Christian belief had nearly ceased for lack of material. Mahometans surrounded the Christian nations on every side from Finland to Granada. Mongols, Turks, Saracens and Barbary pirates cut off communication between Europe and the mass of the heathen world. Between the Mahometans and Christians war was incessant, and there was small chance to offer instruction in religion to men whose own creed was established and maintained by the sword alone. To preach Christian doctrines to Mahometans in their own land meant quick death for the foreign preacher. The mission of the first Franciscans to Morocco was an example of this. The religious activity of Christendom could find no practical field for mission work to unbelievers. It employed itself otherwise—in the discussion and definition of theology, in founding universities, in building cathedrals and monasteries. The acceptance of the Catholic faith as God's best gift to man was universal through Western Europe. The desire to spread a knowledge of it

to other men was also universal, but in the existing conditions it was rather a devout aspiration than a thing of actual practice.

The earlier European expeditions to America illustrate this character of the age. The first care of Isabella of Castille, when Columbus brought back the tale of his discovery, was that the natives of the new found lands should be taught the Christian faith. That the task would be any more difficult than providing instruction for some neglected village of Spain seems not to have occurred to any of her advisers. The few Indians who were brought over by the Admiral were placed in private families for instruction in Christianity and the ways of civilized life as would be done with so many abandoned children in Spain. The royal orders commanded that the Americans should be similarly instructed in their own land with no apparent realization of what such a task meant. The records of the early expeditions give many illustrations of the childlike simplicity which believed that religion had only to be offered to uncivilized men to secure its acceptance. Grave university doctors drew up summaries of the Christian doctrine in academic form and sent them to the West Indies to be communicated to the natives there as sufficient grounds for their becoming Christians at once. A chaplain of Magellan's administered baptism to several hundred Malay natives of Cebu without any further preliminaries than their consent to the ceremony.

It was not long, however, before a clearer conception of the nature of mission work appeared. The pioneers of San Domingo abused their power by forcing the natives to work as slaves, under the pretext that their conversion would be thus more easily brought about. The enslaving of the Indians was thus attempted as a supposed means of spreading Christianity. The conscience of the better men in the young colony revolted at this theory and at the harsh treatment inflicted on the helpless heathens. The Dominican Montesinos refused to absolve Indian slaveholders. Father De Cordova, the prior of the Dominican community and the first Inquisitor of Spanish American history, maintained the right of all men to personal liberty regardless of their belief or unbelief. Natural justice, he declared, forbade any infringement on the liberty or property of others, whether Christian or infidel. The celebrated Las Casas became convinced of the truth of these teachings and devoted the rest of his long life to the defense of the American natives against the wrongs inflicted by Christians of his own creed.

Las Casas and De Cordova, however resolute in their defense of the natives against oppression, were also imbued with the true missionary spirit of Catholics. To bring the Indians to the knowledge and practice of the Catholic faith they felt to be the highest boon

they could offer them, and to that task both devoted themselves. Las Casas as a secular priest, as a Dominican friar, as Bishop of Chiapa and as the official protector of the Indians, spent nearly sixty years in devising practical methods for the conversion as well as the civilization of the Indians of America. That end, he told Charles V., was the only ground on which the right to occupy America had been granted to Spain by the Sovereign Pontiff. He further maintained that the conversion of infidels can only be lawfully made through instruction and persuasion, by enlightening their minds and gaining their wills to the acceptance of Christianity. The employment of force for such an end he declared not only useless, but criminal on the part of Christian men. These principles he maintained before Ferdinand and Ximenes, before Charles V. and Philip II. He fought for the rights of the natives as men in places and scenes of every kind. His voice was heard in San Domingo, in Peru, in Mexico and in Central America. In Cuba he struck up the swords of Spanish soldiers in the heat of battle; in Mexico he faced Cortez in the fulness of his fame. In royal councils, in Rome with Popes, in Spanish universities and in courts of justice he successfully fought for the natural rights of man through more than half a century. Charles V., in 1538, at his exhortation, forbade enslavement of the natives of America on any pretext, of war, conquest, rebellion, or anything else. Pope Paul II. approved the decree and issued a solemn bull of excommunication against all slavers in the American continent. Both Pope and Emperor at the same time fully recognized the obligation, on Christian principles, of instructing the Indians in the doctrines of the Church by every means consistent with their natural rights as free agents.

That it was possible to win savages to a knowledge and practice of Christian teaching Las Casas himself gave a striking object lesson three years before the above mentioned decrees were issued. While then engaged as a Dominican priest in spiritual duties in Guatemala he undertook at his own risk the conversion and pacification of a hostile tribe which had defeated two or three attempts at conquest made by the Spanish Governor. He first stipulated with the colonial authorities that no soldiers should be sent against the natives, and that, in the event of their accepting Christianity, they should be guaranteed absolute possession of their territory and self-government under the dominion of the Spanish crown alone. This secured, Las Casas and three other Dominicans set themselves to a laborious study of the Quiche language, which was used by the hostile tribe. The Bishop of Guatemala, an accomplished classical scholar, joined in this task. After many months' study and practice the Dominicans prepared a summary of the essential doctrines of the faith in

language intelligible to savages. To make it more attractive to the latter the instructions were put into verse, as the old Saxon Caedmon had done in the early days of English literary life. The Dominicans went further. They set their verses to music suited to the rude instruments used by the native tribes. Some Indians, already converted in Guatemala, were chosen to open communications with the hostile tribe. They were trained to chant the religious poem accurately to the sound of a stringed instrument, and then they went as traders among the natives. The latter heard the message with curiosity, and asked for further information concerning the new doctrines. The messengers told them that they could receive it from certain men among the Spaniards who were neither soldiers nor miners, but lived in poverty, prayer and perpetual chastity. An Indian messenger was sent privately to Guatemala to ascertain whether such men were to be found among the hated European invaders. He found the little monastery and returned with the news to the chief of the tribe. The latter invited the Dominicans to visit his country and instruct himself and his people. Fray Luis Cancer, who afterwards met a martyr's death in Florida, went on this invitation and Las Casas followed him. The chief and most of his people, after some instruction, professed their acceptance of the Christian creed and asked for baptism. Their request was granted, and at the same time peace was made with their Spanish neighbors. Las Casas had accomplished the task in which armed force had failed.

He did not end his labors with the baptism of his converts. He believed that religion could only be securely established when the wandering life of savages was abandoned for fixed abodes and habits of social life. Society in the thought of this Spanish friar of the sixteenth century had two essential elements, liberty and pueblo or town life. Society he held necessary for religious practice as a general principle and he urged the importance of gathering into villages on his converts. The necessity of such a course, if they were to attend public worship and receive instruction in their duties as Catholics, was evident even to the minds of savages. Old habits of solitary independence in the woods and mountains were, however, hard to give up, and it was only by long and patient labor on the part of the missionaries that village life was established among the Indians as well as the Catholic faith. It was established, however, without any interference of European law or soldiers. The district converted by Las Casas received the name of Vera Paz (True Peace) as an exclusively native province. It grew in numbers and civilization gradually, and to-day is a province of the Guatemala Republic, with a population still almost wholly of native American race.

The mission methods used in Vera Paz were generally copied

subsequently through all the Spanish colonies. Personal freedom under native chiefs or officials, village communities for the population, regular attendance at church and religious instructions and only such introduction of foreign civilization as was called for by Christian morals or freely adopted by the intelligence of the converted savages were the main features of all the missions there.

There were other points generally observed in the mission methods. The use of intoxicating liquors was discouraged, though not absolutely forbidden, and as far as possible Europeans, other than those needed as priests or instructors, were not encouraged to settle in the Indian villages. It is noteworthy that the search for mines, which had been the main object sought by the early colonists of America, was generally discouraged by the Spanish missionaries among their converts. In Lower California the Jesuits kept the Indians from the pearl fishery, which might easily have yielded them large profit. In Upper California the existence of gold was known to the Franciscans twenty years before the American conquest, yet they not only did not seek it, but discouraged the Indians from its pursuit. The main object sought in all the missions was to build up a population of Christians, moral in conduct and provided with the necessities of civilized existence. The missionaries did not look on it as any part of their duty to attempt more. If individual natives sought higher culture than the village schools afforded they were given it, or allowed to seek it in the cities among the European population. A similar system is found in the reductions of Paraguay and California, in Venezuela and New Granada and with some modifications in the Philippines. That the native races have been preserved and increased where this Spanish mission system prevailed, and that they have also acquired a sincere attachment to the Catholic faith, are facts of history. It is also undeniable that in other parts of this continent as well as throughout Australia, the Pacific islands and South Africa the native races have melted away at contact with Europeans.

To sketch the development of Catholic mission methods concisely, we would say that at the discovery of America the public sentiment of Europe desired the conversion of its people to Christianity as an abstract sentiment of religion and philanthropy. In the public mind at that time the Christian religion was identified with the idea of civilization. The counsellors of Ferdinand, as Las Casas tells us, expected that when the Americans were made Christians they would naturally develop to an equality with Europeans in other respects. In the debates on the enactment of the "Laws of Burgos," in 1510, Spanish statesmen pointed to the growth in civilization which had

taken place in Germany since the days of Tacitus down to their own, and confidently expected that something similar would result in America if its natives were made Christian. That they would gladly receive such a benefit as soon as offered seemed impossible to doubt. In that point the frame of mind of the Spanish public four hundred years ago offers a resemblance to that shown in our own press on the occupation of the Philippines. Some years' experience in the West Indies showed how different were the practical conditions of conversion from the theories of universities and the philanthropists of mediæval Europe. The value of the object desired was not denied by the men who opposed the methods of the Spanish colonists. Montesinos and Las Casas were as thoroughly convinced of the necessity of Christian faith for the Indians as any of the professors who urged that Christian rulers were bound to gather them into the Church by physical force. But they denied that natural rights could be lawfully infringed even for the good of the individuals coerced. The discussion between Las Casas and the official historian Sepulveda brings out clearly the principle for which the protectors of the Indians contended in their mission work. Sepulveda, as an apologist for the forcible conquest of the Indians, pleaded that only in that way could they be made Christians and, in the spirit of Mr. Kipling in the "White Man's Burthen," he claimed it was the bounden duty of the Spanish authorities to carry it out even at the cost of human lives. He illustrated his theory by the recent killing of Fray Luis Cancer, who had been slain by the Florida Indians when seeking to lead them to their own true happiness. Las Casas, in words of thrilling earnestness, while glorying in the noble life of his martyred associate, declared that his death gave no justification for violence against his slayers. They had not slain him knowingly, he claimed, as a messenger of God, but through a not unnatural error they confounded him with others of his countrymen who had previously ill-treated them. Were they to slay the whole Dominican Order under similar misapprehension, he declared it would not deprive them of their natural rights as men nor warrant warfare against them on the part of Christians. This bold assertion, be it remembered, was not the declamation of fireside philanthropy, but the conviction of one who had given up wealth and position for the hardships and dangers of missionary life among the very savages for whose rights he pleaded. It sums up the true spirit of the Catholic missionary and has been repeated in practice scores of times in Catholic history. When, in 1845, Bishop Epalle was murdered on the Island of San Christobal, as Fray Cancer had been in Florida, his priests presented a solemn remonstrance to the French commander of the vessel in which they came against the reprisal which he was prepared to take.

Persuasion, not force, they declared, like Las Casas, was the only true method for Catholic missionaries to use.

Thus, in the middle of the sixteenth century, while Catholic principles were predominant in the greatest nations of Europe, the true lines on which conversion could be effected were accurately and heroically proclaimed. It was a spiritual, not a temporal work, and the temporal agencies used in it must be wholly subordinate to the spiritual ends. Christian missionary work should only be attempted by those who held their lives ready for sacrifice in its discharge. There had been already cases in which purely human objects of conquest and the acquisition of wealth had been sought under pretext of religious zeal. The life work of Las Casas was to bring before the Christian world the true nature and principles of Christian missions. That he was not unsuccessful the subsequent history of the Spanish colonies is proof enough.

The mission work of the same century in Asia was as energetic as in America, though under widely different conditions. In the great empires of China and Japan, and the Mogul in Agra, there was no question of protection for the Catholic teachers by European military power. When Taisosama crucified twenty-six Franciscans and Jesuits in Nagasaki the Spanish Governor of Manila could only ask for the bodies of the martyrs as a favor from the powerful Emperor of Japan. In China and Hindostan the lives of all the missionaries were absolutely and without question at the mercy of the native rulers or mobs. Under those circumstances they won converts by hundreds of thousands. In Japan the Catholics in the early part of the seventeenth century were numbered at two millions, and two hundred and fifty years later a population of many thousands were found still holding the faith delivered to their ancestors by St. Francis Xavier. In China they reached probably a million and in India at least as many. A Chinese Prime Minister and a son of the great Mogul Akhbar were reckoned among Christian converts. In remote Annam, where European vessels were unknown, a Christian population of nearly a quarter of a million was formed by French and Spanish missionaries, and after fifty years' ferocious persecution it has grown to over a million in our own time. In all those lands persuasion, not force, has been the only method adopted. It is significant that conversions in Asia have been most numerous and permanent in the countries where the material influence of European nations was least. The comparison between India under English rule and Indo-China under native government in this respect is suggestive.

A point in the history of modern Catholic missions deserves more attention than it generally receives. It is that poverty has been

regarded as specially favorable to the true missionary spirit. Even Cortez, writing to Charles V. in 1529, urged that only members of the mendicant orders should be sent to convert the Mexican natives. The principle was very generally followed through all Catholic missions since. There have been no great monastic bodies engaged in building up establishments, as in the older days of the conversion of the barbarous nations of Europe. At first the religious orders all vowed to personal poverty, and later congregations moulded on similar if less strictly defined lines have been the chief agents in Catholic missions of the last three centuries. In England during the Saxon and Norman dynasties a fifth of the land belonged to the monasteries founded by the early missionary teachers of the people. In the Philippines, after three hundred years, the whole landed possessions of the orders do not form half of one per cent. of the soil, while much the larger part is still unclaimed by any proprietor. In California, after seventy years of the Jesuit missions, the royal officials found absolutely no property to seize except the churches and residences of the missionaries. A similar state of things generally prevailed through most Catholic missions. Poverty as the best condition for successful missionary work has been not only recognized but practiced in the Catholic missions to the heathen.

It should also be noticed there has been very little of narrow nationalism in them. Whatever existed was chiefly found in the Portuguese Asiatic settlements, where in some instances Spanish priests were refused a residence even as missionaries. In the Spanish dominions and elsewhere the Church knew no distinction of nationality. The German Kuhn and the Italian Salvatierra founded the earliest Californian mission. In its work we find German, Bohemian, Sicilian, Italian and even Scotch teachers indiscriminately. In Paraguay the same thing is to be seen. In China the Italian Ricci and the German Schall were the two leading figures of the seventeenth century. An Irish Augustinian, Father Esterlik, is found in the Philippines in 1640. The Italian Nobili was the most successful missionary of Southern India. The Spanish Dominicans and the French Congregation of Foreign Missions have shared equally in forming the Christian population of Annam.

As to the visible result of Catholic missionary work since the discovery of America, we must confine our inquiry to the populations which were wholly heathen at that time. It would be misleading to reckon the populations sprung from Christian ancestors, but now settled in lands beyond the seas, as a result of missionary enterprise properly so called. The Spaniards and Portuguese who settled South America and Mexico and the Irish, French and German emigrants who brought their faith with them to America or Australia

are not Catholics through the modern missionary work which we are now concerned with. We are only concerned with the number of those whose ancestors or themselves have been made Christians since the beginning of the sixteenth century. While it is not easy to get to perfect statistical accuracy, we believe it safe to say they number at least forty millions to-day. The Indian population of Mexico and Central America must reach twelve millions and that of the South American continent not less than twenty millions professing the Catholic faith. In China the Catholics number a million; in Annam, nearly the same; in India, over two millions, including the Portuguese and French territories, and in the Philippines, seven millions. The Portuguese colonies on West Africa count another million. All of these are either converts or the descendants of heathens converted to the Church since Columbus first crossed the Atlantic. They form at least a sixth of the whole Catholic population of the world.

The expansion of Christianity is essentially a spiritual movement, and its external results only partially represent its true value. Still the numerical increase of professing Christians, the substitution of Christian worship and moral standards for those of paganism or other systems may reasonably be regarded as an evidence of the spread of Christianity. To all who believe the Christian religion to be the work of the Almighty Himself its diffusion among men must be regarded as the highest progress humanity can make. In the centuries before the last it was so regarded by Catholics and Protestants alike. It is, however, a simple historical fact that missionary work for its diffusion among heathens and Mahometans at least was all but exclusively left to the zeal of Catholics. Dominicans and Franciscans and Jesuits spread the faith among the natives of America from New Mexico to the St. Lawrence, while the zeal of the New England Puritans never reached beyond the limits of Massachusetts. Catholic Japanese gave their lives for their belief by tens of thousands, while the Protestantism of Holland could give no better sign of its Christian belief to the heathen than their readiness to trample on the Cross of Christ for the sake of trade privileges in Japan.

Having thus shortly examined the nature of mission work as practiced by the Catholic Church, it is well to see what is the meaning of the same term in non-Catholic usage. On the separation among European Christians of the Reformation the religious activity of the Protestant countries was employed otherwise than in converting unbelievers to Christianity. That such work was a good one, in the abstract, was recognized by Protestants not less than by Catholics. The former, however, made little attempt to practice it for more than

two centuries after the time of Luther. It was not for lack of opportunity. England and Holland during the seventeenth century were the greatest naval powers in Europe, and both were active in colonization in heathen lands. Neither, as a power, made any attempt at introducing its religion to non-Christian races. In America Eliott, Brainerd and Mayhew preached to the Indians near the Puritan settlements and enrolled some hundreds as converts, but the work was not continued on the death of the first missionary enthusiasts. The Indians of New England were destroyed, not evangelized. In other colonies they were left to their own devices as far as religion was concerned. In India the English and in Java the Hollanders made it part of their policy not to disturb the natives with any religious teaching. Indeed, Job Charnock, the founder of Calcutta, seems to have practically enrolled himself as a worshiper of the Hindoo deities. The Dutch colonists in South Africa, while fanatical in the practice of their own creed, did not permit the instruction of the Hottentots in any form of Christianity. The only attempts at Protestant missions down to the close of the eighteenth century besides those already named were made by the Moravians and a few men like the German Schwartz in India. A society for the propagation of the Gospel in foreign parts was founded in London in the days of William III., but it did little beyond some publications of translations of the Scriptures. Towards the end of that century, however, under the stimulus of the discoveries of Cook and other English navigators in the South Seas, an interest was awakened in the subject of missions to the heathen as a desirable national work of benevolence. Its course was in the following manner:

A body of ministers of the different Nonconformist sects, after long discussions in the press, finally organized the "London Missionary Society" in 1795. A gentleman named Dr. Haweis submitted a memorial to the organization recommending the South Sea Islands as the most suitable field for conversion. The reasons given, as told by Mr. Campbell, the author of "Jethro," were the following:

"Of all the regions of the earth which are yet in heathen darkness, the South Sea Islands appear to combine the greatest prospect of success with the smallest number of difficulties.

"1. The climate is unequaled. The cold of winter is never known, the trees are clothed in perpetual foliage and during most of the year bear fruit; the heat is constantly alleviated by alternate breezes, while the natives sit under the shade of groves, scattering odors and loaded with fruit, the skies always serene and the nights beautiful. The diseases which ravage Europe, unless imported, are unknown; health and longevity generally mark the inhabitants.

"2. The government is monarchical, but of the mildest form, with little authority and no written law, no use of letters.

"3. Religious prejudices are not unconquerably strong. Their priests are not invested with the power to persecute, nor can the people be averse to hear us on a religious subject, since they reverence us as their superiors on almost every other.

"4. The language is simple and may be easily acquired."

The missionary society thereon decided that a vessel should be provided with accommodation for "thirty missionaries, exclusive of women and children, and navigated by a serious captain and crew." Tahiti, the Friendly Islands, the Marquesas, the Pelew Islands and Hawaii were named as the scenes of the proposed missionary work, and "the voyage was to be profitably terminated by the vessel passing on to China and procuring a freight homeward from the East India Company."

Several thousand pounds were collected and the vessel was purchased and started on her way. She landed her missionary passengers at various islands in the course of 1797. The voyage of the *Duff*, as the vessel was named, is recognized on all hands as the beginning of the enterprises now known as missionary among both English and American Protestants. The difference between their nature and the life work of Xavier, Ricci, Brebœuf, Damien and other Catholic missionaries can be judged from the instructions given by the "Missionary Society" to the captain of the *Duff*. That gentleman's commission combined both temporal and spiritual authority as far as an ordinary mind can understand it. It ran thus by way of beginning:

"We, the directors of the institution, not only invest you with the command of the ship and with full and complete authority for the management of its concerns in relation to the voyage, but also commit to your care and superintendence during the same period the more important charge of the mission itself, and especially of the faithful brethren who accompany you therein. . . . You will cheer the spirit that is liable to droop under its anxieties, or administer the word of admonition to the disciple in danger of erring."

After some further commendation of the captain-superintendent, the missionary directors went on to the practical details of the work expected of him. He was not to approach the Sandwich Islands, as the natives there might be warlike. He was to ascertain whether the Friendly Islands or the Marquesas group offered the most favorable field for mission work as understood by the society. The points on which his decision was to be made were "the safety of our women, the supply of provisions, the products of the islands in sugar, cotton

and sandalwood and the probability of introducing our improvements" (manufactures). The captain was strictly charged to secure ample land grants, free, as a preliminary before beginning any settlement. "They" (the native chiefs) "must give us a full title to the land we may have occasion for and guarantee us the safety of our property, the enjoyment of our own laws and customs and *the undisturbed exercise of our religion.*"

To secure these concessions the captain was instructed to impress on the natives the material advantages they might expect from the new settlers. He was then to affect complete indifference to settling in that particular place and "to show a readiness to leave the island" in case the chiefs were not willing to cede the desired lands. He might make presents, if he thought fit, but they should not be considered as payments, but as gratuities.

How the instructions were practically carried out is best told in the words of the author of "Jethro." The Duff called at Tonga, and the King and chiefs were invited on board and shown the beauties of the European furniture and mirrors. A cuckoo clock especially amazed the savages. "They gazed at one another with dumb surprise and withdrew in utter astonishment. It was considered to be a spirit, on which account the natives would not touch it, and supposed if they stole anything the bird would detect them, an idea not without use," the missionary writer adds. When the natives had been thus impressed they were told that "the men whom the Duff had brought could *teach them these arts* and also better things." They seemed quite transported. The captain "wisely seized this opportunity to mention everything that could tend to exalt their idea of the missionaries, inquiring if Mumuea acquiesced in their residence with him, and also what provision he would make for their comfort. The magnanimous barbarian replied that they should have a house near his own till a more suitable one could be provided, with a piece of land for their use, and that he would see that neither they nor their property should receive the slightest molestation." The missionary captain closed with the offer and left some ministers and mechanics with their families to start the colony. They took muskets with them for the defence of their property as well as the chief's promise.

The expedition was by no means exclusively made up of religious teachers. Mechanics of different kinds, smiths, carpenters, doctors, etc., were reckoned among the missionaries. Dr. Williams, of Rotherhithe, at a parting sermon, suggested the prospect of getting married into the families of the chiefs as one means of promoting the so-called missionary work. "Are you not going to Tahiti?" he asked, "an island for the sake of whose sensual delights a ship's crew

has mutinied. I dissuade none of you from forming an honorable and Godly connection, but first see that it be honorable and Godly. Let not the Christian missionary, the Christian mechanic be dazzled by the prospect of alliance with the noblest families of the land with the presumptuous hope of afterwards making them Christians. Oh, may none of you be led in triumph by them *until* they are led in triumph by divine grace. *Are you wiser than Solomon?*"

We are told that on the arrival of the Duff in Tahiti one of the missionaries showed he was not wiser than the monarch in question, and made an immediate alliance with a chief's daughter. He was, however, duly read out of meeting in consequence.

The settlement in Tahiti was made under similar conditions to that in Tonga. The settlers were fairly well provided, moreover, with means of defense and attack. "They sent ashore an addition of arms and ammunition, which made their arms two swivels, eight muskets, one blunderbuss, nine pistols and nine swords, fifty-six gun flints besides those in use, powder, ball, drum and fife." This is the concise description of the chronicler of the Duff. The writer of "Jethro," shortly after making this quotation, naïvely declares: "In Polynesia conquest and thralldom were not the steps to conversion. The soldier and the missionary were not messmates. Gunpowder and the Gospel were not carried in the same packet." Battles between the adherents of the missionaries and their pagan brethren were recorded within a very brief period.

The Duff returned to England with a profitable tea charter from Whampoa, and Captain Wilson reported the skill, perseverance and success of the mission to the London Missionary Society. Large subscriptions followed in England, and the Duff was sent out again. The directors gave the new captain his instructions, which throw a clear light on their ideas of mission work.

"The civilization of the untutored heathen requires the united efforts of various individuals with diversified talents and the exemplification of the influence of *social institutions*. By these means a gradual and solid process towards the maturity of wisdom and goodness in the understanding and heart may be expected to be produced abundantly *in succeeding generations*."

The salvation of souls of existing men by preaching and example in the way shown by St. Paul seems to have formed no particular part in the programme of the new society of apostles. Indeed, they do not seem to have been at all sure what religious doctrines they desired to teach the heathens whom they had undertaken to convert. The directors of the London Missionary Society belonged to no less than six differing denominations, and the men whom they engaged as missionaries were examined by a committee, each of whom

held different beliefs. When the selected candidates got on board the Duff two of them held strong Arminian tenets, while the majority leaned to Calvinistic ideas on the subjects of grace and predestination. The clerical missionaries held counsel together, and the two Arminians were finally compelled to suppress any public expression of their convictions. A committee was then appointed, with the captain as chairman, "*to examine the sacred volume and report on its statements respecting Christian doctrine and ecclesiastical order.*"

Swift, in his most cutting sarcasm, has hardly uttered anything to compare with this o'er true tale of a body of would-be missionary teachers trying to find out their own belief while actually under pay to teach it to others.

If there was hopeless haziness in the religious doctrines to be offered the heathen, there was strict exactness in the directors' instructions regarding the material business of the enterprise. Captain Robeson, who had been gunner on the first voyage, was given command on the second expedition, though associated with a clerical assistant for the "more spiritual branches of the mission." The captain was ordered to regard the stations established or to be established not merely as missions, but "little models of a Christian community," an economy of well regulated families. "The principle of utility" was to guide the location of "missionaries" in particular localities. "At Tonga there is at present no smith" was one reminder. "Two surgeons were to be left at Tahiti, but only one in every other island." He was to find some "island furnishing argillaceous earth" for mission work, because one of the brethren engaged "understood the business of pottery." The instructions about securing lands and "comfortable accommodations" for the missionaries and the warnings about giving nothing in payment for the same, were identical with those given to his predecessor.

It is evident enough from these particulars that the actual objects of the London Missionary Society were quite different from those which have been associated from the beginning with Catholic missions. They are very much the same as those of the English East India Company or Hudson's Bay Company. To secure lands, to build up trade, to plant colonies, agricultural or manufacturing, in foreign lands are objects which had been attempted many times since the days of Columbus by the different nations of Europe, but no one had dreamed of calling them by the name of missions. Alvarado and Cortez and Raleigh and Hudson had gone forth on such errands before. It was reserved for English intelligence, in the eighteenth century, to take up colonization under the name of religious zeal. Commercial enterprise, school teaching and sending doctors and mechanics to earn a living in foreign lands may be good works in

themselves, but they have nothing in common with the work by which Christianity has been spread over the world.

The commercial character of the so-called missions in Polynesia, as well as their results for the natives, may best be told in the words of Dr. Anderson, the official missionary historian of Hawaii. He writes:

"The cost of the Sandwich Islands mission (to the American Board of Missions) up to 1869 was one million two hundred and twenty thousand dollars; that of the Micronesian mission, one hundred and fifty thousand dollars. Should we compare this cost with that of *railroads, steamships, naval expeditions*, or a single week in our late Civil War, the sum would not appear large. Its contribution was *the result of the interest awakened by this very mission*. The isles of the Pacific have been a *productive working capital* both in this country and Great Britain by reason of the early and great success of missions among them at the outset of the mighty enterprise of the world's conversion. They were missions to the more accessible and plastic portions of the heathen world, pioneer and, in a sort, tentative missions, and we may well doubt whether, without them, missions would have been prosecuted on a large scale in India and China."

When we are told in the *Literary Digest* of New York that a sum of twenty-five millions was gathered for missionary purposes in this country last year, we cannot deny that in a financial point the investment of twelve hundred thousand dollars in the Hawaiian mission between 1820 and 1869 was a profitable one for the gentlemen who have the disposal of the missionary funds. It is especially so, as the twelve hundred thousand was raised not out of the pockets of the board which expended it, but on the strength of "the interest awakened by the mission." In every country where wealth abounds men are ready to apply it to objects of public interest. Mr. Carnegie is devoting his millions to founding libraries, Mr. Rogers left his wealth to a museum of antiquities, James Lick, an ignorant and ill-tempered mechanic, left a fund for an astronomical observatory. In like manner numbers are found to give freely to missionary bodies who can "awaken interest" by accounts of undefined philanthropic works to be done in distant lands. No fault need be found with these applications of money, but it is wholly misleading to confound any of them with the quality of Christian charity as practiced by a Vincent de Paul, a Peter Claver or a Don Bosco. It is the same with the application of the term "missionary" to the commercial enterprises which have assumed that name in English and American usage. No one likes to hear the title belonging to a Damien applied to the collectors of loot in Peking or the overthrowers of the native

government in Hawaii, however large the revenue resulting from such a misappropriation of names may bring to the appropriators.

The essentially commercial character of the great run of the so-called missions finds further illustration in Dr. Anderson's pages on Hawaii. The mission there had begun in 1820 and the "missionaries" had contracts with the board which gave them a right not merely to support while at work, but also to provision for their families after a certain period. "In 1848 an application was received (by the American Board of Foreign Missions) from five families for permission to come home with twenty-five children, and there were sixteen other families in the mission that would soon be similarly situated. Should an unqualified assent be given to those asking permission, the next year might be expected to bring home twelve more members of the mission and more than thirty children. With such precedents, should they be followed, it would require but a few years to withdraw almost every family."

One thinks he is dealing with a body of covenanted civil servants as he reads Dr. Anderson's account of the troubles of the American Board on this occasion. Like the pension list of our army, the retired missionary stipends threatened to bankrupt the organization. The difficulty was averted, however, by quartering the pensioners, in large part, on the native government, as officials or occupants of the lands made over for missionary purposes. This illustration of the spirit of the missionary work in Hawaii needs no comment.

However satisfactory, in a financial point, the work of Protestant missions has been to those engaged in them, the results to their objects have been different. Dr. Anderson, indeed, declares that "the value of God's grace at the islands as set forth in his volume is beyond the reach of human calculation." We fully agree with this statement, but there are certain tangible results required before we can pronounce the imposition of new ways of life on a people a "work of divine grace." The doctor admits that it is hard to say satisfactorily whether the Hawaiian people were nationally Christianized or not at the close of the great awakening in 1841. They were "rude in their dwellings and social habits and were sadly wanting in thrift." However, he maintained that it would not be any less true that the Hawaiian nation had been evangelized, and the "foreign mission work completed," *should the nation cease to exist* at no distant day. Morality had so far advanced "that *female virtue is a known fact* in these sunny islands where a few years ago the name was unknown and the fact unheard of."

"We are laboring," Dr. Gulick, another missionary, writes, "not alone for the Hawaiians of the present, but with an eye to the Anglo-Hawaiians of the future (including the missionary children), and the

higher we lift the race the more influence do we exert on the people that are to succeed them."

Material profits are counted down closely by the present standard in the ledgers of the American Missionary Board. The spiritual advantages of conversion, it seems, are to be obtained-among another race in the distant future. The spirit and objects of so-called missionary work as practiced by the large majority of Protestant associations in our own time are, we believe, fairly illustrated by the history of the Duff and of Hawaii as told by their directors. To plant colonies of families professing some form of Protestant belief in foreign lands as models for the heathens, to supply them with ample resources of civilization, to maintain themselves in social comfort and to furnish professional services as doctors and teachers to such as are willing to employ them appear to be the chief agencies relied on to spread belief in the Christian faith among men. For that the contributions of the benevolent at home are asked by the missionary directors. Payments are made to employés on strictly commercial principles, but whether any Christian doctrines are spread abroad or not is quite immaterial. If the heathen to-day die in their ignorance or vices, either their children or some other conquering race will yet be Christian in the lands they now occupy, at least so it may be hoped.

In describing the general character of the "missionary" work carried on at the present time under Protestant auspices we do not mean to say that individual instances of genuine zeal for the spread of Christianity may not be found in Protestant missions. We recognize it in the work of Eliott or Brainerd in former times, or in the aspirations of Berkeley or George Heber. Men like these, however we differ from their creeds, have at least a conception of missionary work. In that they are world apart from the commercialism which finds its work in building up colonies, securing lands and trade privileges and sending out unemployed professional men to be supported on the alms of benevolence collected in America or England.

It is of special importance for Catholics to realize that these commercial or literary enterprises which assume the name of missionary have nothing in common with the work to which thousands of both men and women are giving their lives to-day in foreign lands. A Massaja and a Jacobis in Abyssinia, a Chanel or a Battailon in Oceanica, a Venard, a Cornay or the martyr Bishops, Hermosilla, Ochoa, Henares or Delgado in Tonquin, Father De Smet or Bishop Demers in our own country were all in name and fact missionaries. Their labors must not be forgotten or derided because some thousands of men indifferent to dogma or conversion to any creed have taken to themselves the title of missionary. As the abuse of free

interpretation of the Scriptures made the name of "Biblicals" of ill repute among Catholics, though the Sacred Scriptures are the special deposit of the Catholic Church, so there is risk that the missionary name may become synonymous with mere material greed and unctuous cant in the ears of Catholics among ourselves. It is a matter of regret that vocations to the mission life have been hitherto scarcer in English-speaking countries than among the Catholics of France, Spain, Italy or Germany. The deficiency may, possibly, be in a part connected with the low idea of "missionary work" made familiar to the American and English public by the methods of the commercial missionaries of our own time. It is well that the distinction between such and Catholic missions should be widely known and recognized.

BRYAN J. CLINCH.

San Francisco, Cal.

CHRISTIANITY AND PAGANISM IN ROME DURING THE TRANSITION PERIOD.

I. FROM THE ACCESSION OF CONSTANTINE TO THE DEATH OF MAXIMIN (A. D. 306-313).

BY the abdication of Diocletian at Nicomedia on the 1st of May, 305, and on the same day, by mutual agreement of Maximianus Herculeus, his colleague at Milan, Galerius became sole master in the East and Constantius Chlorus in the West; while under them Flavius Severus and Daza, afterwards known as Maximin, governed, with the title of Cæsar, the first the provinces of Italy and Africa, the second Syria and Egypt. This arrangement prepared the way for the execution of God's design to establish in the centre and stronghold of paganism a Christian Emperor. It placed upon the throne of half the empire Constantius Chlorus, father of Constantine the Great, whose marble statue set up in his lifetime in the Baths named after him in Rome has kept guard for centuries at the entrance of the Lateran Basilica, mother and mistress of all the churches.

Constantius Chlorus is described by Eusebius in glowing terms. "Of the four Augusti he alone kept peace with God: the others razed the churches and oratories of the Christians to the ground, he never soiled his hands with their ruin: the others slaughtered the worshippers of the true God, he always preserved his soul innocent of

that crime: the others were sunk in the lowest superstition and slaves to demons. He allowed liberty of worship to all, they harassed their subjects with taxes and made life more miserable to them than death. Constantius was the only one of the four who ruled in peace, and whose government was paternal."¹ These qualities must have endeared him to his people, but they also made the senior Augustus regard him with diffidence if not suspicion, and when it was hinted that although the people might be contented, the coffers of the State would be found empty, a commission of inquiry was appointed to investigate and report. When Constantius heard this, he called the most wealthy of his subjects and told them that he was in need of money, and asked them to show their friendship. They responded at once by filling his treasury with gold, silver and other precious articles, each one trying to outdo the other. He then invited the messengers to inspect the collection and report to their master what they saw. After their departure he recalled the donors, thanked them for their ready generosity and directed them to take back their property and return to their homes.²

This anecdote is an example of Constantius' mild and paternal rule: Eusebius relates another incident which reveals another feature in a higher level. A fresh persecution arose, and special orders were sent to the Governors of the provinces all over the empire to exterminate the Christians. The signal was given in the imperial palaces, which contained numerous officials and dependents professing the faith, and countless martyrs suffered at the time. Constantius, too, received orders to put the edict in force, but evaded the command by a stratagem. He summoned to his presence all the palatine dependents, from the lowest class of servants to the highest rank of judges, and put two alternatives before them, requiring from them an immediate choice. If they consented to sacrifice to the idols, they might remain in the palace with their customary emoluments; if they refused to sacrifice, they would be dismissed from his service. When they had all made their choice and ranged themselves on opposite sides, Constantius addressed them, disclosing the purpose he had hitherto kept secret; sternly rebuked those who had weakly conformed, and praised the recusants for their steadfast adherence to their religion. The former, he said, were traitors to their God and unworthy to serve their prince, and he dismissed them from his service; the others he took into his special favor and appointed to offices of the greatest responsibility.

Eusebius proceeds to contrast Constantius with his colleagues, and to set in relief his virtuous life, his belief in one only God, his abhorrence of polytheism, his house blessed with the prayers of holy

¹ Eusebius, "De Vita Constantini," I., xiii. ² *Ib.*, xiv.

men, his whole family, wife, children and servants consecrated to the King, God, so that the multitude that was congregated in his palace differed in nothing from an assembly of the faithful: among the rest there were also some ministers of God, who prayed without ceasing for the Prince's welfare, while elsewhere the very name of Christian could never be mentioned.³

The attitude of Constantius towards the Christians, both during his subordinate position as Cæsar and after his elevation as Augustus, was peculiar. Perhaps it is going too far to say with Eusebius that he never gave execution in his States to the latest proscription of Diocletian. Lactantius is probably more exact when he writes that in order not to seem in conflict with his colleagues, "he suffered all their meeting places, a few bare walls that could easily be built up again, to be cast down without doing any harm to the living temple of God, who dwells in man."⁴ Compared with the other princes who reigned at the time, he was no persecutor. Tolerant of all worships, and with a special leaning towards Christians, among whom he had many friends, he made no objection when his wife Helen joined them some years after her marriage. But he himself never professed the faith, although he willingly conversed with priests and Bishops and made them welcome in his circle. His condition of mind was not singular at the time; a broad spirit of toleration had become common among the educated classes; paganism had lost its hold on their intelligence and even on their imagination; they were tired witnessing the cruel punishments inflicted on those who refused to give divine worship to what many of themselves treated with scorn. Christianity, too, was beginning to be a power that had to be reckoned with, not from fear of a rebellion among its adherents, but from a dread in those who wielded power, of the chastisements that so often fell on its oppressors. The veneration of Eusebius for Constantine the Great and the enthusiasm which makes his life of that Emperor a panegyric rather than a history may perhaps affect also his description of Constantine's father; but the moderation of Constantius Chlorus is testified many years after his death by the words in the petition of the Donatists to Constantine: "We make our petition to you, O Constantine Emperor, because you come of an upright stock; your father, alone among the Emperors, never enforced the persecution, and so Gaul was spared the infamy."⁵

³ Eusebius, "De Vita Constantini," I., xvii. ⁴ "De mortibus persecutorum," XV., "Constantius, ne dissentire a majorum praeceptis videretur, conventicula, id est parietes, qui restitui poterant, dirui passus est, verum autem Dei templum, quod est in hominibus, incolume servavit." ⁵ "Rogamus te, Constantine Imperator, quoniam de genere justo es: cujus pater inter caeteros imperatores persecutiones non exercuit; et ab hoc scelere immunis est Gallia." Optatus, "De Schismate Donatistarum," I., xxii.

Constantine was born in 274. He was the eldest of a numerous family. He spent his earliest years in the house of his father, under the care of his mother Helen, who became a Christian some years after his birth, and after passing through the sorrow of a forced separation from her husband, imposed for reasons of state, and a long widowhood, lived to an advanced age in the exercise of charity and devotion, to die a holy death and merit the veneration of the Church as the Empress Saint down to our own day. In the tolerant circle of his father's home the boy was brought up, making the acquaintance of many Christians, learning something of their religion, familiarizing himself with their belief and observances and profiting by their conversation and example. When Constantius was promoted to the rank of Cæsar and had the province of Gaul assigned to him it did not suit the policy of Diocletian to allow Constantine to accompany him to the seat of his government, where he would naturally be looked upon as heir presumptive to his father in the West, because it was his design to substitute adoption for heredity in the succession of Cæsars. He accordingly requested Constantine to remain in his service, where he was soon in high favor, one proof of which was his being selected to accompany Diocletian in his progress through Palestine and taking the first place on his right hand on ceremonial occasions. His features were handsome, his figure tall and majestic and his dignified bearing made him the centre of observation in every assembly, but his modesty gave a special grace to all his movements. His cultured mind, his knowledge of classic writers, his discretion and prudence, his activity, insensibility to pleasure and many virtues marked him for a career of great distinction. He took part in the wars of Egypt and Persia and rose to the rank of tribune of the first class. His surroundings at court and in camp were very different from what he had been accustomed to at home, but the new examples did not efface the impressions of his early youth in Gaul. He was not seduced, but repelled, by the manners of his new associates, although he carefully endeavored to conceal his feelings. He was particularly indignant at being made to witness the cruelty of the persecution on one of its first victims, and his hatred of the cruelty increased his contempt for the chief actors and his sympathy for the sufferers. The jealousy of the two Emperors, Diocletian and Galerius, especially of the latter, who in the declining health of Constantius Chlorus was looking forward with confidence to the time when his death would leave him sole master, was a cause of anxiety to Constantine, and he seized the opportunity when Galerius reluctantly consented to his father's repeated request and gave permission to visit him, to depart immediately, and by forced stages he succeeded in outstripping the pur-

suers sent to intercept him. He arrived at Boulogne when the Emperor was about to cross the Channel on his last expedition to Britain; a victory over the Caledonians finished the campaign. Very shortly after Constantius died in the imperial palace in York, on July 25, 306. He was buried with due honor, and the army at once unanimously elected Constantine, who presented himself in his father's purple and was enthusiastically applauded. Galerius when he heard the news thought it prudent to dissemble his chagrin, and accepted the accomplished fact, giving, however, only the title of Cæsar to Constantine. He, too, adopted tactics of dissimulation, and resolved to wait for his opportunity.

Severus, a favorite of Galerius, meanwhile received the title of Augustus. But his reign was of short duration. The Romans, disgusted at the arbitrary violation of their privileges by the minions of Severus, who neglected the government and lived away from the city, chose Maxentius, son of Maximian, in his place. Maximian joyfully left his seclusion to support the fortunes of his son; his experience, ancient dignity and reputation in arms added strength to the party of Maxentius. At his request Maximian resumed the purple, and when Severus, roused from his indolence, made an attempt to enter Rome he was repulsed; and, compelled to surrender after a battle near Ravenna, at the command of his conqueror put an end to his own life. Constantine and Maximian were now near neighbors and almost face to face. The latter crossed the Alps, had a personal conference with Constantine, made an amicable arrangement with him, and gave his daughter Fausta in pledge of the alliance. Constantine was now trimming and watching the approaching conflict between the masters of Italy and the Emperor of the East and deliberating how he might best serve his safety or ambition in the event of war. The situation of both, exposed to similar dangers, drew Constantine and Maximian together in spite of their difference of character, and they united their forces in common defense.

Galerius made an unsuccessful attempt to recover Italy and returned into the East. He raised his friend Licinius to the rank of Augustus in place of Severus. This promotion provoked the jealousy of Maximin, who was vigorously engaged in the oppression of Egypt and Syria, and disdaining to bear longer the inferior title of Cæsar, extorted that of Augustus. The Empire was now, for the first time, governed by six Emperors: Maximianus Herculeus and Maxentius in Rome, Severus in Italy, Constantine in Gaul, Galerius and Maximin in the East. Bitterly opposed to each other, they cautiously refrained from open hostility till after the death of the two older princes. Maximian fell a victim to his own severity and ex-

actions, which irritated the populace and provoked the prætorians to revolt, and to escape their fury he left the city. Maxentius, his son, was elected by the soldiers in his place as absolute sovereign. Maximian first took refuge in Illyricum, but Galerius, who knew his treacherous disposition, did not think himself safe till he expelled him from his dominions; he then fled to the protection of his son-in-law, Constantine, in Gaul, who received him honorably, but refused to be drawn into his quarrel with Maxentius. In his exile he did not relinquish his intrigues; detected twice in a conspiracy against Constantine, and pardoned, he abused the generosity and hospitality of his benefactor by plotting against his life. Constantine was this time relentless, and gave to Maximian the choice of the manner of his death; he chose hanging.

Galerius in 310 was attacked by a malady which is described in details too revolting to be repeated by historians of the time. An abscess formed in his body and turned to cancer, which did not confine itself to the surface, but penetrated to the entrails. Myriads of worms swarmed over the living carcass and filled the air with a pestilent odor. It was the punishment of the most notorious persecutors of God's people in the Old and New Testaments repeated in Galerius, worthy successor of Antiochus and Herod. No skill of physicians availed to alleviate his sufferings, and in despair he turned to the gods. Both Esculapius and Apollo failed him; an oracle of the latter divinity prescribed a remedy which only aggravated his malady.⁶ Then he bethought him of the God of the Christians and of his cruel treatment of them; and emaciated with pain and half his body rotting away and the other half enormously swollen, he resigned himself to the humiliation of surrendering to the Majesty of God, professing repentance and imploring forgiveness and a respite from the torments he could bear no longer. From his sick bed at Sardica he issued an edict which was published at Nicomedia on the last day of April, 311, bearing his name and the names of his colleagues, Constantine and Licinius. It is not known whether the draft was submitted to them, but Galerius might well depend on their consent, for Constantine was not a persecutor and Licinius only a half-hearted and intermittent one, as he thought it politic. The text has been preserved to us by Lactantius in Latin and in a Greek translation by Eusebius.⁷ It is as follows:

"Among many measures which we were promoting for the public good we desired long ago to restore uniformity of discipline in accordance with the ancient laws and customs of the Romans, and especially to bring the Christians who abandoned the religion of their fathers to a better mind. But such was their obstinate folly that they could not be brought to follow the ancient observances

⁶ Lactantius, "De morte persec.", xxxiii. ⁷ Eusebius, "Hist. Eccl." viii., 17.

ordained by their founders, but invented regulations at their caprice, and in several places collected congregations who met apart. At last when we commanded them all to return to their ancient customs many obeyed through fear, others suffered punishment; still the great majority persevered in their obstinacy, and now we see that they neither give honor and worship to the gods of the country nor due reverence to the God of the Christians. Prompted, therefore, by our extreme clemency and our habitual disposition to be lenient with every one, it has seemed good to us to extend our indulgence also to them and to allow from this time forward Christians to exist as such and to permit them to resume their assemblies, provided nothing is done against the public peace. In another letter we shall give instruction to the magistrates for their guidance. For this our indulgence let them pray to their God for our safety, for the prosperity of the State and their own security. This edict is given at Nicomedia on the day before the Kalends of May, in the eighth year of our consulate and the second of Maximin's."⁸

In this singular document one does not know what to marvel at most. False statement, insidious suggestion, hypocritical pretence, to give to the cruelties of his persecution a justification in the interest of the State and of the Christian religion itself. He puts himself forward not as a repentant persecutor, but as an unsuccessful reformer. He laments that the Christians have fallen away from their primitive simplicity and split into sects. The remedy he now applies is a general absolution, or plenary indulgence, for the past and liberty to worship as they please in the future. With impudent audacity he overlooks his own atrocious deeds, done for the interest of the Church; how the confessors were condemned to the mines, maimed and crippled by previous torture; how the oratories were rifled and destroyed, the sacred books and registers burned or carried off, the arenas of the amphitheatres reeked with the blood of martyrs and the pyres were still smoking. This edict, insolent and abject at once, a masterpiece of hypocrisy and dissimulation, concludes with a petition for the prayers of the Christians, disguised under words of dubious meaning.

Galerius did not long survive the edict of toleration. A few weeks after its publication he expired in terrible suffering, recommending with his last breath his wife and son to the protection of Licinius, who had hastened to his bedside in appearance out of affection for his friend, in reality to be ready to lay hands upon his inheritance. This friend two years later put both wife and son to death.

The superscription prefixed to this edict in the version of Eusebius does not contain the name of Maxentius, who ruled in Rome and its

⁸ "De morte persec.," xxxiv.

district, or of Maximin, who governed the provinces of Syria, Egypt and Cilicia, in the East. The authority of Maxentius was not recognized by Galerius, but there was peace in the regions under his rule and no occasion to promulgate an edict of toleration for the Christians at that time. In the East the condition of the Christians was far different. Maximin, "that most wicked of men and deadly enemy of religion," as he is called by Eusebius, ranked by Saint Jerome in his enumeration of the greatest persecutors, Valerian, Decius, Diocletian, Maximian, "saevisissimus omnium Maximinus"⁹—the most ferocious of all—gave the edict an evasive execution. He did not dare to suppress the document altogether, but would not publish the text. He gave verbal orders to Sabinus, Prefect of his Prætorium, to write a circular letter to the prefects of the provinces embodying the prescriptions of Galerius' rescript and commanding the judges to set at liberty all who were in prison on account of religion and abstain from further persecution. The letter of Sabinus is given by Eusebius:

"For a long time the majesty of our sacred Lords the Emperors, in their constant anxiety to make all men lead pious and regular lives, used every endeavor to bring those who had gone after strange rites and customs back to the worship of the immortal gods. But the pertinacity and obstinacy of some have now gone so far that neither the command of the Emperor nor the fear of penalties deters them. Seeing, therefore, that many are in trouble on this account, our invincible princes, in their clemency, have ordered us to signify to you that when a Christian is brought before you charged with following his own religion, you are to set him at liberty immediately, and not permit him to be punished in any manner. For experience has shown that no persuasion will ever make them change. Write accordingly to the superintendents (curatores) and magistrates of the various districts and towns and let them understand that henceforth they have no jurisdiction in such matters."¹⁰

The officials obeyed this order with alacrity, believing in the sincerity of Maximin and that they would gratify him by their promptness. The transformation that ensued immediately was marvelous. "Like fires from heaven lighted on earth, shining brightly after the darkness of a long night, churches were reopened in every city and filled with congregations of the faithful, celebrating the sacred mysteries with accustomed ancient rites."¹¹ The heathens wondered at the sudden change and many confessed that only the one true God could have wrought it. The confessors liberated from prison were acclaimed with the honor given to martyrs who had faithfully fought; those who had in their weakness hesitated or fallen away came

⁹ In cap. II. "Zachariae." ¹⁰ "Hist. Eccl.," ix., 1. ¹¹ Ibid.

repentant to ask the mercy of God and the prayers of their brethren. Those who had been condemned to hard labor in mines and quarries were welcomed as victors from the athletic contests and accompanied in groups to their homes as they went joyfully through the streets singing canticles and hymns to God.

When the Christians were congratulating each other on the end of the persecution Maximin was chafing under the mortification and planning a more terrible trial for them. Six months had not passed from the promulgation of the edict when the Emperor Galerius died, and Maximin became sole ruler in the East. Two competitors were in wait for the succession of Galerius, Licinius and Maximin. Constantine stood aloof. Diocletian, secluded in his retreat at Salone, did not interfere and was not even consulted. At first it seemed that the question would be referred to the sword, and that a civil war would decide the result. This was, however, avoided by an amicable arrangement between the two rivals to divide the spoil. An incident occurred at this time which embittered the hostility of Maximin to the Christians: Valeria, daughter of Diocletian and widow of Galerius, rejected the addresses of Maximin, who aspired to marry her, offering to repudiate his own wife. The refusal of Valeria exasperated Maximin, and supposing that her objections arose from religious scruples, a relic of her Christian profession which she renounced to wed Galerius, he resolved to have his revenge on them and began to study how he might do this without coming to a breach with his colleagues.

He now initiated that insidious policy which best suited his character of duplicity, pretending moderation while steadily advancing towards the most extreme severity. He craftily availed himself in the first place of the ambiguity of the edict and of the fact that it had never been formally published in the dominions subject to his rule. With caution and prudence he was assured of his ultimate object—the destruction of the Christians. Less than six months after the death of Galerius he began by revoking all concessions made to the Church. The oratories over the martyr's tombs were the first object of his attack. The veneration of those champions of the faith, his own victims, appeared to him an insult and a defiance. In October, 311, he interdicted all assemblies in the cemeteries. By degrees he came to regard the Christians as a low caste of an inferior race outside the protection of the law, too contemptible as yet to be punished by fire or sword. But his blows fell heavy on them; coldly deliberate, and calculated to cut, but leaving no trace of a wound.

His next move was to create a fictitious public opinion favorable to his policy, to make it appear when the time came for him safely to use more rigorous measures that he was only yielding to the pres-

sure of his subjects. He employed emissaries to start a general agitation against the Christians for their banishment. Maximin was not content with giving directions, but made a progress through his States and received deputations and preconceived petitions from various towns, asking for the expulsion of the Christians. He found an efficient lieutenant and organizer of popular opinion in Theotecnus, a wily, cruel and unscrupulous man, who held the office of *Curator*, or chief municipal magistrate in Antioch. Before the year was ended he had notices posted in the chief cities of the province with false charges against the morals of the Christians and old calumnies revived. The petitions and rescripts, decrees of banishment and other sentences were inscribed on tablets of bronze or marble and affixed to columns erected in the forums or market-places.¹² To rouse still more the populace he appealed to their superstition. He invented a new divinity, dedicating a statue to Jupiter Philius, Jove the Gracious, which was consecrated with a new ceremonial and execrable rites. The worship had its initiations, mysteries and expiations—parodies of baptism and penance. An oracle was installed with priests in charge, and its first utterance was a command to expel the Christians. Other cities imitated the example of Antioch, and Maximin, to preserve uniformity and order in the new cult, instituted a gradation of functionaries in imitation of the Christian hierarchy, with its Bishops, priests and deacons. In the capital city of the province a high priest, *Sacerdos*, was head of the whole organization; in the smaller towns a "*flamen*" was the local superior. They had both spiritual and temporal authority, symbolized one by a white mantle, the other by an armed body-guard. Inferior officers were appointed to inspect and keep order—on the whole, a fair attempt at a counterfeit. By extraordinary ceremonies Maximin endeavored to revive reverence for idolatry, and by slander to bring contempt on the belief and practices of the Church. Directly attacking the person of Christ, he scattered false gospels broadcast among the people and sent them to the provinces with orders to the magistrates to make them widely known. He had counterfeit Acts of Pilate, with a description of the trial and judgment of Christ filled with impious blasphemy, distributed in the schools, to be committed to memory by the children and recited in their exercises of declamation. The malignity of the enemy went the length of suborning dissolute women to present themselves in the

¹² An inscription in Greek and Latin was found at Arykanda in Asia Minor. It contains part of a petition from the inhabitants of Lycia and Pamphylia to Maximin in 311, asking him to expel the Christians, who are called "*atheî*," so that the citizens may be free to give themselves to the worship of the gods and pray for the welfare of the emperor and his colleagues. A few lines of the answer in Latin are preserved on a separate fragment. Apparently it was favorable to the petitioners. See De Rossi, "*Bullettino di Archeologia Sacra*," 1894, p. 54.

tribunal as converts from Christianity and testify to infamous deeds of ordinary occurrence in their assemblies. The false testimony was recorded in the proceedings of the court and reported to the Emperor, who ordered it to be affixed in the forum of every city under his jurisdiction.

We have followed thus far the progress of Maximin's animosity against the Christians in this the last of his persecutions. Beginning with his vexatious and cruel treatment of the two princesses and their sympathizing friends, his antipathy grew from a personal dislike and desire to be revenged to generalize in its hatred all who professed their religion. Up till now he had not shed a drop of blood, but he had no longer any fear of active interference on the part of his colleagues, and decreed the commencement of a violent persecution at once. The magistrates were commanded to resume the search for Christians, which had been suspended after the latest edict of toleration, with special orders to seize first all the Bishops and priests conspicuous for their activity in preaching the faith. The list of martyrs would fill the pages of a martyrology. Silvanus, who had been Bishop of Antioch for forty years, was condemned with three others to be thrown to the wild beasts; Peter of Alexandria was beheaded with a number of Egyptian Bishops; Lucianus, a priest, was carried to Antioch and cast into prison, where he was slain; Methodius of Tyre, and many more, suffered in various ways. All who were in any way prominent fell victims, but the Emperor's agents disdained to make a process against obscure persons, and it was in this way that Saint Anthony the Hermit was defrauded of the martyr's palm, to obtain which he had left his cave in the desert. He received instead the staff of the patriarch and became the father of a progeny of holy imitators of his solitude that will never fail, but will form a circle of glory round his head for all eternity.

Maximin congratulated himself on the favor which the gods were showing after the revival of fervor in their worship through his exertions. He could not refrain from thanking the gods in terms of triumph for the fair weather of the summer of 311 and the promise of an abundant harvest. Eusebius has preserved his manifesto, copied from the bronze tablet on which it was inscribed in the forum of Tyre. It begins by congratulating the citizens on recovering their spirits and bidding them trust in the protection of the immortal gods, who had already shown so many signs of their benevolence. He tells them that their city deserves to be called the home of the immortals, and continues: "Preferring the public good to your local petty interests, you appeal to us to protect the religion of the country. In reward for this Jupiter and the other divinities are showing you how they provide for you. It is by their special favor

that the earth does not reject the seed you sow; that the sun does not burn everything up, and drought wither the crops; that you do not suffer from floods and storms and earthquakes and other calamities that carried disaster so frequently during the past years when error was allowed to run rampant. Rejoice that by your prayers and sacrifices the warlike Mars has been appeased and peace restored. Most of all, let those rejoice who have been delivered from their blindness—like men recovering from a dangerous illness, who find that life has still some benefits in store for them. If any persist in their detestable error they shall be banished according to your petition, that your city, purified from their contamination, may be free to give itself entirely to the gods. To show our pleasure in receiving your petition without waiting to hear what other requests you have to make, we grant them all in reward for your piety.”¹³

This is a specimen of a pagan discourse, probably inspired by some of the neo-platonic favorites who at that time swarmed in the palace precincts. It is a song of triumph chanted too soon, just at the eve of the final defeat of idolatry. The event very quickly gave the lie to the prophetic part. A famine and a pestilence followed immediately this boasting defiance, and a war in Armenia ended in disaster to Maximin. Three scourges came together to confound the arrogance of the tyrant. The distress of the people, in the country and in towns, was extreme, among the wealthy as well as the poor. Rich proprietors were reduced to sell their land for food, ladies were seen in the forum holding out their hands for alms, men like ghosts dragged themselves wearily along or stumbled in their exhaustion and lay prostrate on the ground, weakly imploring a crust of bread. Corpses were left unburied and devoured by dogs, and men who had still a little strength left hunted the voracious starving animals and killed as many as they could to stamp out a species of rabies that made dogs attack the living. The wealthy and well provided with food did not escape the pestilence, which rather seemed to single them out, the rapid but acute suffering of the malady always ending fatally. Everywhere was desolation; in the streets, lanes and open spaces where music and song before resounded nothing but wailing was heard.

During this calamity the devotion and charity of the Christians to sufferers without distinction astonished the pagans, who could not conceal their admiration. Dividing themselves into groups for the various sections of the city, they were seen in turn taking charge of the sick and dying or burying the dead, who otherwise would have mostly remained abandoned in their houses or in the streets. They divided their bread with the famished, and their generous self-sacri-

¹³ Euseb., “Hist. Eccl.,” iv., 7.

fice regained the esteem of the grateful populace who had been disaffected to them for a time by misrepresentation and fraud, and extorted even from their enemies the highest praise. The proud tyrant himself had to bow his head to the visible chastisement of Divine justice and cease from troubling the people of God. The taunt of Eusebius is well deserved: "*Hujusmodi praeium fuit superbissimae illius Maximini jactantiae, et decretorum quae civitates adversus nostros ediderunt.*" "This was all that Maximin gained by his proud boast and the decrees of the cities against us."¹⁴

He had yet to pay the last penalty of his wicked deeds in a most abject humiliation and in a painful malady that reduced him to a condition as miserable as the end of Galerius.

But it was not Maximin, but Maxentius, who accelerated the catastrophe of paganism, and in order not to lose chronological sequence in the narrative we must return to the West and describe important events that were maturing there. Maxentius in Rome emulated the enormities of Maximin in Nicomedia. He began by affecting a leaning towards the Christians; he forbade all prosecutions and put on the mask of a pious and merciful ruler. Soon he cast it aside and perpetrated every sort of abominable crime, sparing no class or order of victims to gratify his avarice or passion. For a trifling fault he ordered a general massacre of citizens, committing the slaughter to the praetorians. Individual Christians had to suffer from the extortion and vices of the Emperor, but collectively they enjoyed a certain toleration and even favor. The Christians had no complaint to make of their treatment by Maxentius, and it was even after the declaration of war between the two competitors that he issued his famous edict ordering restitution of the property confiscated from the Church and authorizing Pope Melchiades to recover legal possession of it along with the cemeteries.

Religion was really not the cause of the brief war that ended so disastrously for idolatry. On pretence of avenging the death of Maximian, Maxentius, in 311, declared war on Constantine and ordered all the statues that had been erected to him in Italy and Africa to be cast down with ignominy; then made preparations to invade the Gallic provinces. Constantine, anticipating him, crossed the Alps at the head of forty thousand men, to carry the war into Italy. The enterprise was full of danger; the armies of Maxentius amounted to a hundred and seventy foot and eight thousand horse. But the hardy, well disciplined legions of Gaul, trained by the intrepid, self-denying invader, were more than equal to a contest with troops enervated by indulgence and luxury in the capital under an inexperienced commander.

¹⁴ *Ib.*, ix., 8.

Constantine led his army over Mount Cenis and descended into the plains of Piedmont, arriving before the fortified city of Susa before the court at Rome had notice of their departure from the banks of the Rhine. The siege did not detain them long; they set fire to the gates and stormed the place, putting to the sword the greater part of the garrison, but the remains of the city were preserved from total destruction. A doubtful engagement with an army of Italians in the plains of Turin, furnished with heavy cavalry after the fashion of the East, ended after the flight of the Maxentians to Turin, where they found the gates shut against them, in the slaughter of almost all by the victorious pursuers. Milan, Verona and the whole of Italy between the Alps and the Po embraced with enthusiasm the party of Constantine. Verona, an important place with a strong garrison under Pompeianus, could not be left in the rear of an army advancing upon Rome and had to be reduced by siege; then two roads, the *via Aemilia* and the *via Flaminia*, were open to Rome.

Maxentius had not himself left Rome during the campaign because an oracle had menaced his life and Empire if he left the city. He sent his best generals in his stead. His resources were still great; an army was at his command more numerous than the armies lost in the two great battles in the north, before Turin and Verona. But it was far from the intention of Maxentius to lead his army in person. He trembled at the apprehension of such an untried experience as the exercise of war, but had to bend to the contempt of the people. Meanwhile Constantine rapidly advanced till within sight of Rome and pitched his camp at a place called *Saxa Rubra*, an excellent strategical position for an invading force, distant from the city about eight miles. To his surprise and satisfaction, he found the enemy ready to give battle on the north side of the river, where it is crossed by the *Milvian Bridge*, and prepared to dispute the passage. Lactantius says:

"The morrow was the sixth of the Kalends of November and the anniversary of the assumption by Maxentius of the imperial purple and the termination of the *Quinquennalia*. Constantine was admonished in his sleep to mark the heavenly sign of God upon his shields, and give battle. He did as he was commanded, and ordered the letter X with the upper bar bent across, the monogram of Christ, to be emblazoned on all the shields. Armed with this sign they advanced to the attack. The enemy approached to meet them, but without their Emperor, and crossed the bridge. The two opposing vanguards closed in assault. Both sides fought bravely; neither thought of retreat. News of the battle reached Rome; a riot broke out in the city; the people complained that the Emperor had deserted the public weal. Then of a sudden the populace (gathered together

in the circus for the games given that day) raised a loud cry, 'Constantine is invincible!' Terrified at the shout, Maxentius roused himself from his lethargy, and calling together some Senators had the Sybilline Books brought to be examined, and it was found that on that very day an enemy of the Romans would perish. Flattered by this answer as an assurance of victory, he took his place at the front. After he passed the bridge broke down. At the sight the battle raged more fiercely, and the hand of God was stretched over the array. Maxentius, filled with terror, turned in hasty flight towards the bridge that was broken in two, and crushed by the multitude of fugitives fell into the river and was drowned."¹⁵

Lactantius, it is to be observed, was a witness beyond criticism, an intimate friend of Constantine, no dreamer or repeater of idle stories, called by the Emperor himself to be tutor to his eldest son Crispus, and must have received from Constantine's own mouth the account of this important event in his career.

Of equal authority, and in greater detail, Eusebius gives two accounts, one brief, in his history, and another more complete, in his "Life of Constantine."¹⁶ Of both what follows may be considered a sufficient summary that can be controlled by the references:

Constantine was extremely anxious when he first entered on his campaign against Maxentius. He had come to be persuaded that more than military force and skill was required to overcome an enemy formidable by the number and experience of his legions, and was considering to what heavenly power he should recommend his cause. He had lost all faith in the divinities of Rome, and he remembered that his father, who alone of all the Emperors had never persecuted the Christians, never suffered an eclipse of his prosperity, and contrasted his success with the disastrous and miserable end of all who had persecuted the Christians, although they were assiduous in paying worship to the national gods. The failure of such protectors to help in time of need did not invite Constantine to put his confidence in them in his present difficulty, and troubled and undecided, he turned to the half-determined conception which he had learned from his father of a Divinity one and supreme, and besought Him to give some visible sign for his guidance. His prayer was heard.

A little after mid-day, when the sun was beginning to descend towards the horizon, he saw a flaming cross in the sky, over the sun, with the words: "Hac Vince," "By this conquer." He himself and all the soldiers who accompanied him saw the miraculous sign and were filled with astonishment. Constantine was still revolving

¹⁵ Lactantius, "*De morte persecutorum*," xlv. ¹⁶ Eusebius, "*Hist. Eccl.*," ix., 9. "*De Vita Constantini*," I., xxvii., 31.

this in his mind when night fell, and during his sleep God's Anointed, "Christus Dei," appeared to him bearing the sign which he had seen in the sky and commanded him to have a military standard made like it, to be carried in front of the troops as a safeguard in battle. The Emperor employed skilful workmen to fashion the standard, which consisted of a tall staff plated with gold, having a shorter transverse beam forming a cross. On the top of the staff was a wreath or crown, wrought of gold and precious stones; in the centre of this wreath were designed the first and second letters of the name of Christ in Greek, X P, the P decussate in the middle.¹⁷ These letters the Emperor adopted also to ornament his helmet. From the transverse beam of the staff was suspended a purple banner of costly material, richly embroidered with gold and pearls and precious stones, beautifully wrought and of magnificent effect. Between the wreath and monogram at the top of the staff and the embroidered banner a medallion was fixed containing busts of Constantine and his sons. Similar standards were provided to every division of the army to be borne in front.

Constantine made his entry into Rome on October 29, the day after the battle. At the head of his victorious army, with the Labarum carried for the first time in triumph, he went direct to the Palatium. He was met at the city gate by the whole Senate and equestrian order, their wives and families, and an immense crowd gathered to welcome him. He went direct to the Palatium, accompanied by the acclamations of an ever-increasing multitude, who in their eagerness to see their deliverer pressed forward almost to pass the "sacrum limen" and invade the precincts of the imperial quarters.

Immediately after the battle at the Milvian Bridge he issued an edict putting a stop to the persecution of the Christians. This edict has not come down to us, but it contained certain limitations and restrictions which Constantine on reflection considered unfair and remedied in the edict which he signed with Licinius in the following year, 313. He gave orders to place the trophy of the cross, as the Labarum came to be called, in the right hand of a statue which the Romans were about to erect in his honor in a public place in the city. He himself dictated the inscription: "By this saving sign, the badge of true valor, I liberated your city from the slavery of a tyrannical yoke and set free the Roman Senate and people, restoring

¹⁷ Eusebius, "Hist. Eccl.," ix., 9. "Vita Constantini," I., 27-31. He introduces his account of the vision by saying that he tells it in his history as Constantine himself related it to him many years after, when Eusebius was admitted to his familiarity, confirming its truth by an oath: "Horis diei meridianis, sole in occasum vergente crucis tropaeum in coelo ex luce conflatum, soli superpositum, ipsis oculis se vidisse affirmavit, cum hujusmodi inscriptione: Hac Vince. Eo viso et seipsum et milites omnes, qui ipsum nescio quo iter facientem sequebantur, et qui spectatores miraculi fuerant, vehementer obstupefactos."

them to their ancient dignity and splendor.”¹⁸ The Senate appointed the 28th and 29th of October to be kept every year with the celebration of public games, and inscribed in the civil calendar as “*Evictio Tyranni: Adventus Constantini*,” in memory of their deliverance. It was rather a work of supererogation to decree to the victor the title of First of the Augusti, but Constantine was politic enough to accept it gravely. By the same authority a temple to Romulus in the forum was rededicated to his honor, and a triumphal arch was hastily constructed out of material from old buildings and bas reliefs taken from an arch to Trajan transferred to adorn the monument to Constantine.¹⁹

Constantine was merciful in the exercise of severity to the leaders of the defeated faction, putting only the son of Maxentius and some of his most cruel and unprincipled agents to death. But the prætorians, who had so long domineered over Rome and made themselves the ready instrument of every changing tyranny, were disbanded and abolished forever, and their fortified camp, a perpetual menace to the city, dismantled. Rome had regained her liberty.

One of the first acts of Constantine after his victory was to send a peremptory message to Maximin to cease from persecuting the Christians. This communication, conveying almost a threat in case of refusal, Maximin did not dare to disregard openly, but he gave it a very ungracious compliance. Instead of frankly disavowing or revoking the policy of the past and promising toleration in the future, he limited himself to sending a rescript to the Prefect of the Prætorium, counselling him not to use violence but persuasion and gentleness in his efforts to bring the Christians back to idolatry.

Constantine did not insist on more at that time, but he was busy preparing a document which was to lay the foundation of the whole fabric of successive legislation in ecclesiastical policy. This was what is known as the Edict of Milan, promulgated in the beginning of 313, with the consent and superscription of his colleague, Licinius, then a faithful ally. The dispositions of the edict were not new; they were substantially the same as those ordained in the rescripts of Gallienus fifty years before, addressed to the Bishops, and later

¹⁸ Euseb., “*Hist. Eccl.*,” ix., 9.

¹⁹ An inscription on both fronts of the arch is important from the veiled allusion, “*Instinctu Divinitatis*,” to the divine inspiration conducting Constantine to victory:

Imp. Caes. Fl. Constantino Maximo
P. F. Augusto S. P. Q. R.
Quod instinctu divinitatis mentis
Magnitudine cum exercitu suo
Tam de tyranno quam de omni ejus
Factione uno tempore justis
Rempubliam ultus est armis
Arcum triumphis insignem dicavit.

(Under the central arch: *Liberatori Urbis. Fundatori Quietis.*)

decreed again by Galerius in his edict of 311; with regard to church property "*loca ecclesiastica*," it had been anticipated by Maxentius in his missive to Pope Melchiades. But those previous decrees were political expedients, serving a temporary purpose or promoting a particular policy of the ruler of the day; this edict is the formal expression of a fundamental principle to be held and applied for all time to come and inherent in the very essence of the organized body that was receiving its first solemn charter. It abolishes every disability and consecrates the liberty of the Christian conscience to worship according to its laws. The following is a version of the text from Lactantius, preceded by the introductory paragraph given by Eusebius, but omitted by the earlier writer:

"It is now some time since we, recognizing that religious liberty is not to be restricted, but every one left free to worship as he pleases, ordained that Christians and all others should continue to follow the belief and observances of their respective sects. But because in that decree an invidious distinction was made among the members of various sects, some gave up their religious practices.²⁰

"Therefore We, Constantine and Licinius, Emperors, discussing in friendly congress at Milan certain matters affecting the peace and happiness of the people, especially concerning the public worship of the Divinity, have agreed to grant to the Christians, and to all persons, liberty to profess any religion they please, so that the Deity who presides in His heavenly dwelling may look down appeased and gracious upon us and all our subjects. Moved by these just and salutary considerations, we ordain that no one is to be hindered from following the observances of the Christians or conforming to that religion which they prefer, and this in order to merit a continuance of the favor of the Supreme Deity before whom we all freely bow down. You are therefore to abolish all restrictions formerly imposed on Christians by former instructions through your office, and henceforth permit every one who wishes to practise the Christian religion, to follow his choice without let or hindrance. We wish you to understand distinctly that we give absolute and entire liberty to the said Christians to worship according to their religion. You must also remember that we have given the same free and public exercise of other religions for the sake of peace, because we have no desire to diminish respect to any form of religion. Furthermore, with regard to the Christians, we ordain that if the places where they were accustomed to assemble have been confiscated, even by written orders through your department, either by our Fiscal or by any other person soever, they are to be restored to the Christians without cost or expense, setting aside any opposition

²⁰ Eusebius, "*Hist. Eccl.*," x., 5. What follows is from Lactantius.

or evasion. All who have received property of theirs in gift must restore it as quickly as possible to the Christians; all who acquired it, either by purchase or gift, if they wish to appeal to our benevolence, may petition us through the Vicariate, and their case will be considered. All this property is to be conveyed to the body corporate of Christians without delay. And as the said Christians held not only the places of meeting, but other property belonging to the corporation, that is to the churches, not to individuals, the whole is included by this decree, beyond doubt or question, to be restored to the corporation and meeting places in the manner aforesaid, and any one who is obliged to give back without compensation may hope in our benevolence. In everything endeavor to favor with all your power the body of the Christians, that our orders may be more speedily executed and public security secured. In this way the Divine favor, which we have often experienced, will endure to the happiness of our people and the success of our undertakings. In order that the tenor of these dispositions may be universally known, we direct copies of this decree to be sent in every direction, that this solemn act of our benevolence may escape the notice of none."²¹

Constantine and Licinius sent a copy of the Edict to Maximin, who pretended friendship for both. Tyrant as he was, it irritated him, but on reflection he did not suppress it altogether, but sent as of his own accord a message to Sabinus, his prefect, in the form of a letter. He begins by enumerating all that he had done to bring about a reconciliation with the Christians, and ascribing his failure to their obstinacy. He refers to his desire to be indulgent and to the petitions that poured in upon him asking for their reduction to submission or expulsion. He wished to satisfy these petitions whenever he ascertained that the majority desired it, as he had proved in the case of Nicomedia and other places from which he had banished the Christians, but this could not always be done; and he doubted if the majority really wished their banishment. He accordingly recommends the magistrates not to employ severity, but gentle persuasion, in their efforts to convert the Christians, and avoid harsh or cruel treatment, protect them from injustice and plunder and for the choice of a religion let them have their way. He concludes by directing Sabinus to communicate these instructions to all the provincial governors.²²

No one was deceived by this manifesto; the Christians did not avail themselves of the indulgence, no assemblies were held, no Christian avowed himself publicly. Unlike the concessions of Constantine and Licinius, which made meetings lawful, the edict of Maximin only forbade them to be riotously broken up.

²¹ Lactantius, "*De morte persec.*," xlviii. ²² Eusebius, "*Hist. Eccl.*," x., 5.

The presumption and arrogance of Maximin and his violation of the convention with Licinius soon brought him into collision with the latter. Two months had been sufficient for Constantine to put everything in order in Rome, and in December, 312, he went to Milan to meet Licinius, who was coming to marry Constantia, the sister of Constantine. When Maximin understood that they were occupied in the festivities he seized the opportunity—although it was mid-winter and his troops were reduced in numbers and weakened by privations and want of forage for their horses—to make an irruption into Bithynia. He crossed the Hellespont in safety, but his progress was arrested before the walls of Byzantium, where Licinius had left a strong garrison to protect it from a surprise. The place held out for eleven days, but had to surrender. Maximin was again delayed before Heraclea, which also yielded to him. Licinius hastened his advance to repel Maximin, and the two armies were almost in sight of each other. An engagement was unavoidable; the position was perilous from the inequality of numbers. The army of Constantine was far away on the banks of the Rhine and could not give any assistance, but the soldiers of Licinius had heard of their exploits, and, inspirited by the account of the Divine intervention, made light of the numerical superiority of their opponents, trusting that God would give them the same good fortune. They were irritated, too, by the ostentatious supplications ordered by Maximin in his camp to propitiate the heathen divinities. The tyrant, before the battle which was to decide his fate, placed all his confidence in the power of superstition, the help of his familiar demons and the multitude of his legions, and vowed to Jupiter, if he was victorious, to extinguish the very name of Christian.

Licinius, on the other side, either from a passing conviction or from political calculation, put his cause under the protection of the Deity who had so powerfully assisted his colleague, Constantine. The war on both sides became a religious war. The night before the battle an angel was said to have appeared to Licinius and promised that if he prayed in the morning with his whole army, in certain words, he would have the victory. Licinius obeyed. Copies of a prayer taught in the dream were distributed among the soldiers, to be learned by heart. As day dawned a prayer preserved to us by Lactantius,²³ containing an invocation of One Supreme God, was read in front of the army. An extensive plain, called Campus Serenus, stretched between the hostile ranks. The Licinians, officers and men, took off their helmets, laid their shields on the ground, then raising their hands to heaven, recited together in a loud voice after the Emperor: "Most High God, we beseech Thee,

²³ Lactantius, "De morte persec.," xlvii.

Most Holy God, we beseech Thee. We commend to Thee our just cause; we commend to Thee our safety; we commend to Thee our rule. By Thee we live, by Thee we are victorious and happy. O God, most High, most Holy, hear our prayers. We stretch out our hands to Thee. Hear us graciously, most Holy, most High God."²⁴

This invocation, three times repeated, made such an impression that Maximin consented to hold a parley with Licinius, to spare, if possible, further carnage, but would not agree to terms of peace. The trumpets sounded the attack, and both armies closed in a struggle, hand to hand. The onset of the Licinians was so impetuous and well sustained that it swept all before them. Maximin made futile efforts to harangue the soldiers of Licinius, and offered bribes and threats to induce them to desert, but in vain. No one listened to him, and at last, to save himself from their resentment, took refuge behind his own lines. He quickly saw that the situation was desperate, divested himself of his imperial mantle, and disguised as a slave made his escape from the field unobserved, was able to cross the straits, and in a day and a night reached Nicomedia, his capital, a hundred and sixty miles distant. Taking with him from Nicomedia his wife and children, he pushed on into Cappadocia, where he gathered a few fugitives. Licinius followed close, entered Nicomedia, which capitulated, and on the thirteenth of June, 313, published in that city the edict which five months before had been signed by Constantine and himself in Milan.

Maximin continued his flight into the mountainous region of Taurus, and finally took refuge in Tarsus. It was here that he issued a proclamation giving his adhesion to the Edict of Milan, not in express terms, but in a diluted paraphrase of the original, sufficiently distinct to commit him to it. But it was superfluous, and it came too late. He had not the satisfaction or merit of even tardily setting the Church free in Asia, for it was the Edict of Milan, affixed by Licinius when he passed through Nicomedia, that made the law in the East as well as the West. The text of the edict of Tarsus has only come down to us through a copy made by Eusebius.

The efforts of Maximin had all failed him signally. His legions were routed, he himself had been a fugitive wandering many weeks in woods and deserts, cursing the soothsayers who betrayed him with false prophecies, and he put some of them to death. He had to engage in battle a second time, when again his army was defeated. He did not even die the death of a soldier, for when the remnant of

²⁴ "Summe Deus, te rogamus. Sancte Deus, te rogamus. Omnem justitiam tibi commendamus, salutem nostram tibi commendamus, imperium nostrum tibi commendamus. Per te vivimus, per te victores et felices existimus. Summe sancte Deus, preces nostras exaudi. Brachia nostra ad te tendimus. Exaudi, sancte summe Deus." Lactantius, l. c.

his troops was waiting for his arrival to be led to the assault, a mysterious malady spread over all the surface of his body; he was seized with violent pains and convulsions that cast him violently on the ground, where he rolled in agony with eyes starting from their sockets—his body reduced to a skeleton, the cage of an imprisoned spirit. In despair, and to escape capture, he resolved to end his life by poison, and after the fashion of some suicides of his time, ate and drank to excess before swallowing the draft. His overloaded stomach rejected it and his suffering was prolonged and aggravated. For four days he was a raving maniac, stuffing his mouth with earth scraped from the ground with his fingers to appease his hunger. Striking his head against the wall, he knocked out both his eyes. He fancied that he saw God in anger presiding as a judge at his torture, and kept imploring in pitiful cries the mercy of Christ, till, screaming as if he were being burned alive, he expired.

Thus ended the race of persecutors of the name of God. For Licinius did not imitate after his victory the moderation of Constantine. By his orders Valeria, the widow of Maximin, was thrown into the Orontes and her son and daughter massacred. All who by blood or friendship were supposed to be favorable to the defeated party were put to death. The daughter and widow of Diocletian, Valeria and Prisca, constrained to apostatize by him, persecuted by Maximin and hunted in their obscure retreat by Licinius, were at last arrested in Thessalonica and barbarously beheaded and cast into the sea.

Well may Lactantius ask, before closing his book, "*De Mortibus Persecutorum*," "Where are now the illustrious names of the Jovii and Herculei, famous in every region of the earth, which Diocletian and Maximian were the first arrogantly to usurp, and which became vile when they passed to their successors? For the Lord hath destroyed them and cut them off from the earth. Let us then keep God's triumph with gladness; let us sing the praises of His victory; let us celebrate by praying, by day and by night, that the peace which He has granted to His people may be confirmed unto them forever."²⁵

J. A. CAMPBELL.

Rome, Italy.

²⁵ Euseb., "*De mort. persec.*," lii.

CATHOLIC FRANCE PRIOR TO THE FRENCH REVOLUTION.¹

DURING the reign of the unfortunate Louis XVI. the population of the Kingdom of France is said to have been 33,000,000 souls, the great majority of whom were Catholics.

The fabric of the Church comprised:

Archbishops	18
Bishops	117
Bishops in charge of Foreign Missions.....	11
Canons and Prebendaries.....	800
Ecclesiastics, including dignitaries and priests.....	366,000
Parishes and churches.....	34,498
Parochial annexes having chapels.....	4,644
Universities	24
Academies	36
Heads of religious communities of men.....	16

No kingdom in Europe at a corresponding time, with the exception of the Two Sicilies, had so numerous a hierarchy as that of France. The number of ecclesiastics, dignitaries and priests far exceeded that of any other nation in Europe, while the aggregate of parishes having churches exceeded that of Spain by about 15,000, Spain at that epoch having the largest number of any nation in Europe except France.

In the cities of France there was an aggregate of 960 hospitals, with free beds and attendance for the sick or for those accidentally injured. There were, where most needed, asylums for foundlings, for orphans, for the blind, for deaf-mutes; refuges for incurables, for the aged poor, for helpless cripples, and in fact, "for all the ills that flesh is heir to."² These works of mercy were served by eighteen different orders of religious women, whose head houses were principally in Paris, the mother superior of one of which, renowned for the holiness of its community, had been a princess royal of France, daughter of Louis XV. This is a noble showing for the women of France who had consecrated their lives to religion and to works of mercy.

Some of these institutions had been founded by devoted women who won success by prayer and hard work; others by wealthy ladies of the nobility, and many by ladies of the bourgeois classes. Their financial foundations had been securely arranged, mostly on immovable securities, which had been augmented from time to time by benefactions.

It is an historical fact, however, that many of the financial founda-

¹ "Œuvres de M. Le Vicomte de Chateaubriand." Tome troisième. Génie du Christianisme. Paris, 1836. Œuvres complètes; d'Alexis De Tocqueville. L'Ancien Régime et la Révolution. Huitième Edition. Paris, 1877. ² "Génie du Christianisme, notes et éclaircissements," p. 385.

tions which gave stability to most of these institutions in the cities of France had not been built by members of the royal family nor by wealthy nobles, but by the charitable munificence of wealthy merchants and individuals of the untitled classes.

A parallel of the same charitable spirit among the last named classes at a corresponding time could be found in London, where the guilds of merchants, traders and manufacturers built and liberally endowed hospitals, lying-in asylums, orphanages, boarding schools for boys and girls, libraries and other educational help for apprentices and other young people in service.

While as a rule the wills of deceased British noblemen provided only for relatives, leaving little or nothing for charity, the wills of wealthy merchants and tradesmen usually devised large sums for the institutions founded in by-gone days by their predecessors in their respective lines of trade.

Centuries ago the heads of many of the great monastic orders obtained from the Court of France concessions of large tracts containing many thousand acres of marshy and otherwise apparently irreclaimable lands, a portion of which they proposed to improve, and on which in time was to be built a religious establishment for the members of their respective orders.

These domains at the time could not be sold by the government for agricultural development or even given away for farming purposes to individuals, for the reason that their reclamation would cost more money than was generally available to the average agriculturist. When the tract had been patented to the religious order, with the royal seal in evidence, the chief of the order sent a small colony of monks, including a civil engineer of the brethren, experts in geological knowledge, woodsmen and strong laborers, to their new domain, who were to define and outline with landmarks its boundaries, which being done, its landscape was studied, its soil examined and search made for water, for clay, for gravel and sand, for wood and building materials, and for sites for quarries, while a system of drainage was devised by which swampy places could be converted into ponds and marshes into small lakes, in the vicinity of which, if water was procurable, a suitable site could be made available for the building of an abbey.

The respective plans for all these improvements were mapped out for submission to the abbot when this colony of pioneers returned to their parent house. The process of the study of the plans submitted and the discussions resulting may have exhausted a year or more of time, but when finally adopted and approved by the head of the order they were rarely deviated from and changed only when unexpected difficulties developed such a necessity.

Such part only of the *ensemble* as might be deemed preliminary was undertaken and placed under the direction of a monk skilled in the science of civil engineering who went to the scene of operations in charge of a party comprising assistants, but largely composed of robust lay brothers familiar with hand field labor. A commissary who had charge of the supplies and who was also a cook prepared the simple meals essential for the support of the bodily vigor of men engaged in open air daily toil.

This work was continued during the favorable seasons of each year; suspended at the approach of winter, when the party returned to their monastery, to return again the following year; and so, from year to year, was continued to completion, when another part of the plan of general operation was commenced and carried out in the same systematic manner.

In the process of such vast undertakings time was not taken into account; year after year was passed in this methodical work, just as weeks and months might pass during such operations in modern times. A quarter of a century might elapse before the corner-stone of a monastery would be laid; but how changed the surroundings!

The great domain which when first acquired was so unsightly and so unattractive to human vision had been transformed. Marshes had disappeared and had given place to pretty lakes and sightly ponds, which met the eye in every direction. Great meadows, in which herds of fat cattle roamed and grazed, had replaced the unsightly levels of nature's original landscape. Groves of choice timber, orchards and vineyards, fields of grain of great extent, acres of vegetables, farm buildings and granges gave evidence of thrift and agricultural perfection. As a framework of so much that was agreeable to look upon, graveled roads bordered by umbrageous and well trimmed trees, which shielded the wayfarer from the summer heat, traversed the extensive domain throughout. Even the cottages of the herdsmen were sightly in appearance and nicely surrounded. The domain cultivated to the highest extent yielded by its products a very large income, while it attested the economic results which had been accomplished by the "lazy monks," as they have been stigmatized by uninformed and prejudiced writers.

In time the corner-stone of a monastery was laid by the Archbishop of the province with religious pomp and ceremony. The edifice was gradually built; the material principally used was the more or less sightly stone quarried on the domain. Very little foreign material, except glass and metal, was required.

The same deliberate methods of building from approved plans ensued; but for the decorative work, whether in glass, metal or in wood, experts in each were brought to the scene and retained until

the completion of their specialties. In the same manner the minor organs for the chapels and the refectory, and also the grand organ for the church, were erected and completed during the course of years by skilled organ builders.

When the walls of the chapels, of the great halls, of the refectory and of the church had become thoroughly dry some artist of renown was solicited to come to the monastery to make it his home during the years he was occupied in painting the designated scenes and subjects on the respective walls and ceilings, while it has happened that the painter thus occupied became charmed with the religious surroundings and spent the remainder of his days in the monastery.

The monastery and church when completed were consecrated with great religious ceremonial and grandeur by the Archbishop of the province, and occasionally by the same prelate who had a decade of years previously laid the corner-stone of the grand edifice.

In this manner were the extensive domains acquired and the celebrated monasteries built during the sixteenth, seventeenth and the eighteenth centuries by the great non-educational orders in France. These monasteries were usually endowed by the Government of France with the right of asylum, while their mitred abbots became the local rulers of their respective districts and the mediators, and at times the defenders, of the peasant when his feudal lord became too exacting or tyrannical. While they were centres of holiness, they were also the providence of the poor; from their portals were daily distributed alms, and from their dispensaries remedies for the needy sick.

But some of the great monasteries of France, with others in Europe, became also the centres of learning where much patient study by erudite monks developed and enriched the literature of the past for their own as well as for succeeding generations.³

The term made use of by some modern writers, having reference to some exhaustive literary study, "It is a Benedictine work," is significant in relation to what we have written.

Towards the close of the reign of the unfortunate monarch Louis XVI. the possessions of the Catholic Church in France having an acknowledged legal status, whether in immovable estate or in securities yielding income, represented an aggregate capital of 7,000,000,000 francs, which, even under the paternal administration of religious custodians, yielded an annual income of 200,000,000 francs, equivalent to a much larger sum in modern times.

This large capital, which had been accumulating during centuries, included in its aggregate the extensive domains of the great monas-

³ *Monastères de l'ordre de St. Benoît. Histoire de la Congrégations de St. Maur,*" p. 154.

teries of France. Competent writers have stated that the beneficiaries of this income, from the highest to the most humble functionary or dependent, numbered in the aggregate 400,000.⁴

After the death of Louis XIV. a great change was developed in the *entourage* of his successor, Louis XV. Profligate noblemen became the intimates of the King, while corruption at court and immorality in the salons of the palace succeeded. The honest and distinguished statesmen who had composed the Cabinet of the Grand Monarch, and who had governed France wisely and well, had retired to their estates. Their successors were noblemen of mediocre ability, who sought wealth from the patronage and spoils of office, to the great detriment of the welfare of France.

When the moderate balance left in the treasury by the late monarch had been squandered without national benefit, but to the advantage of courtiers, profligates and especially to their mistresses, and the treasury of France had been depleted, recourse was had to the levying of annual imposts on the merchants and traders of France, while to supplement these exactions the rate of general taxation throughout the kingdom was raised and new taxes created to add to the heavy burden carried by the patient and enduring people.

Wars ending unfavorably, usually followed by treaties of peace, which but too frequently resulted in the loss of distant possessions, marked the reign of Louis XV.

After Louis XVI. had succeeded to the throne of France morality ruled in the court of this unfortunate monarch which had so long been redolent with immorality and corruption. While the financial status of the realm was unsatisfactory, it was by no means hopeless of reform. It was hoped that salutary measures might correct the evils of the preceding reign, which if uninterrupted would in time restore the equilibrium. But such was not to be the experience of the government of Louis XVI.

Under the rule of his predecessor it had become convenient to augment the receipts of the treasury by the sale of the local offices and governmental positions in the hamlets, the villages, the towns and the cities of France. These officials levied the taxes, arranged the *corvées* of the peasants, fixed the imposts and collected the proceeds. Those who were in a position to purchase these offices were not as a rule honest men; they were in many cases neither intelligent nor fair minded. This system of collecting the revenues of France had for years been open to the reproach of dishonesty and corruption.

⁴ "Financial Relations of Church and State in France." By R. R. Elliott. AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW, No. 61, Vol. XVI., 1891.

During its continuance the rural classes, being the most helpless, were the greatest sufferers, and to such an extent that the French peasant had become callous to nearly all sentiment of nationality, which feeling has become more or less hereditary. Under the different systems of government which have succeeded the peasant of France has remained indifferent; *laissons nous tranquille* has become his motto.

Before the close of *l'ancien régime* this feeling of disgust and indifference probably tended to the success of the French Revolution. The taxes of the rural classes had been increased ten-fold during the eighteenth century.

The later years of the reign of Louis XVI. were marked with financial troubles. A debt of 600,000,000 francs had been piled up for public improvements, while the creditors of the government clamored for reimbursement in vain.

It has been generally admitted that the philosophical writings of the eighteenth century were among the principal causes of the Revolution, while it is also admitted that these writings were profoundly irreligious.

Radical propositions were advocated for the abolition of all privileges of caste and class; of professions as a consequence; the sovereignty of the people; the omnipotence of social power, and the uniformity of rule.

All these doctrines formed the essence of the French Revolution, while they are among its fundamental errors.

The spirit of Voltaire had prevailed to a great extent during the eighteenth century. "I have given much attention to the study of history," writes M. De Tocqueville, "but I have found no revolution which at its commencement numbered so many men whose patriotism was so sincere, so disinterested and so truly great."

The nation was open to the principal faults of inexperience and generosity. And yet irreligion had become an evil of immense extent.⁵

The advocates of these new doctrines became possessed with a furious hatred against the Church. They attacked her hierarchy, her clergy, her institutions and her dogmas; while for her complete destruction they attacked the foundations of Christianity itself. This was the apparent motive, but it covered a war against the Church as a political power controlling wealth and influence. It was admitted that the Church could take its place in the new society to be created, but she had occupied an influential position in the old society, which they proposed to annihilate.

The bourgeois classes of the period showed a spirit of indepen-

⁵ De Tocqueville, "*L'Ancien Régime et La Révolution*," p. 230.

dence; they held a greater number of official positions at the time than the same classes hold in modern times. These had been obtained by purchase without being subject to the exactions of those in power. The *ancien régime* prior to its collapse was not a period of servility and dependence. Greater liberty was enjoyed then than a century later; but it was irregular and intermittent. But the only man of superior education who resided permanently among the rural classes and who was always in immediate control was the *curé*.

The clergy of France during the greater part of the eighteenth century, while occasionally intolerant and at times inclined to cling to the ancient privileges of their order, were always opposed to despotism, while favorable to civil and political liberty as much as was the third estate or the nobility. It will be remembered that they numbered, including all classes, nearly 367,000. They proclaimed that individual liberty ought to be guaranteed, not by promises, but by procedure similar to the *habeas corpus*; they demanded the destruction of the prisons of state, such, for instance, as the Bastille; the abolition of exceptional tribunes, of evocations, the publication of all debates, the immovability of all Judges, the admissibility of all citizens to public functions which should be open to merit only; a military recruitment less oppressive and humiliating to the people and from which none should be exempt; the purchase of seigneurial rights which emanating from feudal *régime* were contrary to liberty; freedom of labor; the abolition of interior custom houses; the multiplication of private schools, of which one should be in each parish and free; the establishment of lay circles for benevolent relief or charitable bureaus in all districts, and all necessary aid to be given for the encouragement of agriculture.

In politics they proclaimed more vigorously than others that the people of the nation had the imprescriptible and inalienable right to assemble for the making of laws and to vote for the impost. No Frenchman, they claimed, should be forced to pay taxes for which he or his representative had not voted.

The clergy also demanded that the States General, freely elected, should hold annual sessions for public discussion of important affairs; that they make general laws, against which no private inherited rights or usages could be opposed; that they prepare the budget and control up to the "*maison du Roy*;" that their Deputies should be inviolable and Ministers always responsible to them. They also wished that the assemblies of the State should be created in all the provinces and municipalities in all cities.

Of Divine right, adds M. De Tocqueville, not the least mention.

This liberal disposition in the policy of the clergy was not produced by momentary excitement; it was in evidence in 1779 in the

province of Berry by the offer of the clergy to contribute 68,000 francs on the sole condition that the administration of the province be maintained.

Notwithstanding the views of some of its members, there does not appear in history a parallel body more remarkable than the Catholic clergy of France at the outbreak of the French Revolution; nor more enlightened, nor more national, nor more endowed with private virtues and at the same time with faith, as their persecution has well demonstrated.

"I commenced the study of the *ancien régime* clergy," states M. De Tocqueville, "greatly prejudiced against the order as a class; I have concluded this study with profound respect. In fact, they had only the faults inherent to all political as well as religious bodies which have been well and solidly constructed. They were to some extent combative, occasionally intolerant, while they held a more or less blind attachment to the rights of their collective order."⁶

The storm, like a bloody whirlwind, finally burst over France. Never were the people of a Christian nation so outraged and so brutally scourged as were the French during the *reign of terror*. No example can be found in Scriptural or in political history which can be compared with that bloody epoch. A race of demons seems to have matured in Paris and in other cities whose red hands executed the mandates of the leaders, who in turn ruled and then perished on the guillotine. The most gifted and the most brilliant of the leaders of the revolutionary period went down one after the other, engulfed in the sea of blood.

No better illustration of the animus of the leaders of the French Revolution need be offered, to show their communistic spirit, than the proceedings following the decree of the Revolutionary Assembly in August, 1793, for the destruction of the abbatial Church of St. Denis. It would seem that the Frenchmen composing this convocation had denationalized themselves, so to speak. They seemed to have forgotten that France had had a glorious history; that during the ages of chivalry her line of monarchs, including St. Louis, were the most illustrious in Europe.

The destruction of the monuments and the desecration of the tombs, the last resting places of the Kings and princes of France from the seventh to the closing years of the eighteenth century in the abbatial Church of St. Denis, as witnessed and described by a learned monk of the abbey, during the later years of the "reign of terror," is given *verbatim et literatim* by the Viscount Chateaubriand in his note 46 to his "*Génie du Christianisme*:"

"*Nous donnerons ici au lecteur,*" writes the Viscount, "*des notes bien*

⁶ "*L'Ancien Régime et la Révolution,*" p. 170.

précieuses sur les exhumations de Saint Denis; elles ont été prises par un religieux de cette abbaye témoin oculaire de ces exhumations."

This monk, who was evidently well posted in the genealogical history of French royalty, first outlines the locality of the tombs of the ancient monarchs, which were intact during the first decade of August, 1793, when the edict for the destruction and desecration of all within the sacred enclosure was decreed by the Revolutionary Assembly of 1793.

We reproduce this learned monk's narrative to illustrate the destructibility of the fabric of posthumous national veneration which had obtained during ten centuries by the representatives, so-called, of the people of France during the mad epoch of the French Revolution.

In the sanctuary on the epistle side was the tomb of King Dagobert I., the founder of the abbey, who died in 638, with the two statues in hard stone of this King, the one recumbent and the other erect.

The commissioner appointed by the Assembly was instructed to remove all works of art deemed worthy of preservation to the national collection of fine arts. This seems to have been preliminary to the work of desecrating the caskets. These were lined with lead. Their contents were shoveled out and carted to the old Valois cemetery, where a deep pit had been dug to receive them. In this cemetery was an agent of the commissioner with a furnace, who received all the lead lining the caskets or tombs and melted it into bars to be cast into bullets for the use of the Republican army.

The tomb of Dagobert I. was a fine work of art, representing the vision of a hermit which was said to have appeared to the soul of the dead monarch. The recumbent statue illustrating this legend formed a part of the solid tomb. This had to be broken to obtain access. The erect statue was also broken. Near by was the statue of Queen Nanthilde, wife of Dagobert, which was destroyed.

Toward the choir window, on the same side, near the iron grating, was the tomb of Clovis II., son of Dagobert, who died in 662; that of Charles Martel, father of Pepin, who died in 741; that of Pepin, his son, first King of the second race, who died in 768, adjoining which was the tomb of Bertrada, his wife, who died in 783.

On the Gospel side of the sanctuary was the tomb of Carloman, son of Pepin and brother of Charlemagne, who died in 781. Adjoining was that of Hermentruda, wife of Charles *le chauve*, who died in 869; that of Louis III., son of Louis *le Bègue*, who died in 882, and that of Carloman, brother of Louis III., who died in 884. The tomb of d'Eude *le Grand*, uncle of Hughes Capet, who died in 890, and of Hughes Capet, who died in 1038; that of Henri I., who died in 1000;

of Louis VI., *dit le Gros*, who died in 1137; that of Philippe, eldest son of Louis *le Gros*, who was crowned during the lifetime of his father and who died in 1131; that of Constance of Castile, second wife of Louis VII., who died in 1159.* All these monuments had been constructed during the reign of St. Louis in the thirteenth century, and they all contained stone coffins about three feet long containing the ashes of the princes and princesses. The monuments mentioned above were constructed of hard stone.

The monuments described in their order following were of marble, with the exception of two, which should be noted, as they had been constructed during the century in which had lived the personages whose ashes they contained: The tombs of Philippe *le Hardi*, who died in 1285, and that of Isabelle of Aragon, his wife, who died in 1272, were both hollow, each containing leaden caskets three feet eight inches long, containing the ashes of Philippe and of Isabelle; that of Philippe IV., *dit le Bel*, who died in 1314; that of Louis X., *dit le Hutin*, who died in 1316, as also of his posthumous son, Jean, who died the same year as his father, aged four days, during which the child was considered King, but by most historians not reckoned among the Kings of France. At the foot of the tomb of Louis *le Hutin* is that of Jeanne, his daughter, Queen of Navarre, who died in 1349. Near by was the tomb of Philippe V., *dit le Long*, who died in 1321, containing also the heart of his wife, Jeanne de Bourgogne, who died in 1329; also that of Charles IV., *dit le Bel*, who died in 1327, and Jeanne d'Evreux, his wife, who died in 1370. In the chapel of Notre Dame la Blanche, on the epistle side, Blanche, daughter of Charles *le Bel*, Duchess of Orleans, who died in 1392, and Marie, her sister, who died in 1341. Life-sized statues of each of these princesses were supported by pillars at the entrances of the chapel.

In the sanctuary of this chapel, at the Gospel side: The tombs of Philippe de Valois, who died in 1351, and Jeanne de Bourgogne, his first wife, who died in 1348; Blanche de Navarre, his second wife, daughter of Philippe de Valois, who died in 1373. Near by in the same chapel, supported by columns, were life-sized statues of Jeanne and Blanche.

In the chapel of St. John the Baptist were the tombs of Charles V., surnamed the Wise, who died in 1380, and Jeanne de Bourbon, his wife, who died in 1378; of Charles VI., who died in 1422, and Isabeau of Bavaria, who died in 1435; of Charles VII., who died in 1461, and of Marie of Anjou, his wife, who died in 1463.

Returning to the sanctuary on the Gospel side of the main altar, was the tomb of King John, who died while a prisoner in England, in 1364. Below the sanctuary steps on the Gospel side was the

massive tomb of Charles VIII., who died in 1498, whose statue with the four guardian angels surrounding it had been removed in 1792, and was destroyed August 8, 1793.

In the chapel of Our White Lady were the two white marble statues of Henri II., who died in 1559, and of Catharine de Medicis, his wife, who died in 1589, in recumbent positions on gilded sheets of copper, each clad in their royal robes, with the monograms of each, ornamented with *fleurs de lis*. In the same chapel was the tomb of Bertrand du Guesclin, who died in 1380. This tomb, although not specified in the decree of the general destruction of the others, had been demolished by the force of workmen on August 7; but the statues had been taken to another chapel to await the decree for their final destination. The ashes of the deceased Kings and Queens of France, enclosed in leaden and stone coffins within the hollow tombs and monuments, were buried on the north side of the church, where was the former site of the magnificent Valois tower, which had been destroyed in 1719, and which at the time was used as a cemetery, in one common grave. But little of anything was found in the coffins of lead and stone enclosed within the tombs; in that of Pepin there were the remains of some gilded thread. Each coffin had a leaden plate on which was cut the name, but the greater number of these plates had been badly damaged by rust. All the leaden plates as well as the leaden coffins of Philippe le Hardi and of Isabelle of Aragon, were first taken to the Hotel de Ville, but subsequently melted. The most curious object found during this vandalistic work was the gothic formed seal of Constance of Castile, second wife of Louis VII., who died in 1160; it was of silver and weighed 3½ ounces. This seal was at first brought to the Hotel de Ville, but it was subsequently deposited in the cabinet of antiques in the Royal Library.

The number of monuments destroyed August 6, 7 and 8 was 51. Thus, during three days, the work of twelve centuries was wiped out of existence.

The tomb of Marshal Turenne, which had been spared from destruction, was taken down in 1796 and transported to the Petits Augustins in the Faubourg Saint Germain, where all the desecrated monuments deemed useful to art had been collected. The abbatial church of Saint Denis was roofed with lead, but in 1795 it was unroofed and the lead taken to Paris. In 1796 its roof was covered with slate, as it was claimed at the time, in order to save from destruction such a magnificent work of art.

The splendid iron railing of the sanctuary, erected in 1702 by Pierre Denis, one of the most skilful iron workers of his age, was removed to the library of the Mazarin College in July, 1796. This

same Pierre Denis built similar railings for the Abbey of Chelles while Madame d'Orleans, sister of the King, was mother abbess.

Removal of the mortal remains of the Kings, Queens, princes, princesses and of other distinguished persons who had been buried in the church of the abbey of St. Denis in France was made in October, 1793. Saturday, October 12, was opened the vault of the Bourbons, adjoining the basement chapels. The first removal was that of the casket containing the remains of King Henry IV., who died May 4, 1610, aged 57 years.

The body was found well preserved, while the features of this celebrated monarch were easily recognized. The body, wrapped in the shroud, which was still intact, was exposed to view during two days. On Monday, October 14, the remains of Henri IV., one of the greatest of the Kings of France, were placed in the large pit which had been dug in the northern border of the Valois cemetery, where, as has been stated, the remains of the ancient Kings of France, removed from their broken tombs in the sacred precincts of the abbey, had already been thrown.

On the same day, after the workmen had had their dinner, toward 3 o'clock, the removal of the caskets of the Bourbon Kings was continued: That of Louis XIII., who died in 1643, aged 42 years. That of Louis XIV., the Grand Monarch, who died in 1715, aged 77. That of Marie de Medicis, second wife of Henry IV., who died in 1642, aged 64. That of Anne of Austria, wife of Louis XIII., aged 64. That of Marie Thérèse, princess of Spain, wife of Louis XIV., who died in 1683, aged 64. That of Prince Louis, son of Louis XIV., who died in 1711, aged 50.

The chronicler remarks: "Some of these bodies were well preserved, more particularly that of Louis XIII., recognizable by his moustache; that of Louis XIV., by his impressive features; but his face was as black as ink. The bodies of the others, but more especially that of the son of Louis XIV., were in a state of liquid putrefaction."

At 7 A. M., October 15, 1795, the sacrilegious work of the desecration of the tombs of the Bourbons was resumed. That of the casket containing the remains of Marie Leczinska, Princess of Poland, wife of Louis XV., who died in 1768, aged 65. That of Marie Anne Christine Victoire of Bavaria, wife of Louis, *Grand dauphin*, who died in 1690, aged 30. That of Louis, Duke of Burgundy, son of Louis, *grand dauphin*, who died in 1712, aged 30. That of Marie Adelaide of Savoy, wife of Louis, Duke of Burgundy, who died in 1712, aged 26. That of Louis, *Duc de Bretagne*, first son of Louis, Duke of Burgundy, who died in 1705, aged 10 months. That of Louis, *Duc de Bretagne*, second son of the Duke of Burgundy, who

died in 1712, aged 6. That of Marie Thérèse of Spain, first wife of Louis, son of Louis XV., who died in 1746, aged 20. That of Xavier de France, Duke of Aquitaine, second grandson of Louis XV., who died in 1754, aged 5 months. That of Marie Zéphyrine de France, granddaughter of Louis XV., aged 2. That of the Duke of Anjou, son of Louis XV., who died in 1733, aged 3.

There were also removed from this vault the leaden urns containing the hearts of the first son of Louis XV. and of his wife, Marie Josephine of Saxony; the former died in 1765 and the latter in 1767. Their bodies, at their request, had been buried in the cathedral church of Sens. The contents of the urns containing the hearts of the prince and princess were thrown into the pit above described, as were also the remains of the Bourbons mentioned.

It would appear that the caskets thus removed and despoiled were surmounted with small leaden urns containing the hearts of the deceased. These urns were enclosed in silver and silver-gilt cases and surmounted with silver-gilt crowns. The silver portion was deposited in the treasury of the municipality, while the lead was placed in charge of the commissioner of the government charged with its care.

The violation of the caskets reposing in the vicinity of the chapel to the left and right continued as follows: That of Anne-Henriette of France, daughter of Louis XV., who died in 1752, aged 25. That of Louise-Marie of France, daughter of Louis XV., who died in 1733, aged 5. That of Louise-Elizabeth of France, daughter of Louis XV., wife of the Duke of Parma, who died in 1759, aged 32. That of Louis Xavier of France, Duke of Burgundy, grandson of Louis XV. and elder brother of Louis XVI., who died in 1761, aged 10 years. That of Louis of Orleans, who died in 1611, aged 4. That of Marie de Bourbon de Montpensier, first wife of Gaston, son of Henry IV., who died in 1627, aged 22. That of Gaston, Jean-Baptiste, Duke of Orleans, son of Henry IV., who died in 1660, aged 52. That of Marie Louise of Orleans, Duchess de Montpensier, daughter of Gaston and of Marie de Bourbon, who died in 1693, aged 66. That of Marguerite de Lorraine, second wife of Gaston, who died in 1672, aged 58. That of Jean Gaston of Orleans, son of Gaston Jean Baptiste and of Marguerite of Lorraine, who died in 1652, aged 2. That of Marie Anne of Orleans, daughter of Gaston and of Marguerite of Lorraine, who died in 1656, aged 4.

These removals were accomplished by the evening of October 15, 1793. The remains found in most of the caskets were in a state of putrefaction, which when exposed to the air emitted an offensive odor, which the free use of vinegar and of burnt powder failed to mitigate. Some of the workmen were overcome and made temporarily sick.

The work was continued on Wednesday, October 16, 1793, at 7 A. M. in the vault of the Bourbons. The first casket to be removed was that of Henriette Marie of France, daughter of Henry IV. and wife of the unfortunate Charles Stuart, King of England, who died in 1669, aged 60. Succeeding was that of Henriette Anne Stuart, daughter of Charles I. of England and first wife of the only brother of Louis XIV., who died in 1670, aged 26. That of Philippe of Orleans, only brother of Louis XIV., who died in 1701, aged 61. That of Elizabeth Charlotte of Bavaria, second wife of Philippe of Orleans, who died in 1722, aged 70. That of Charles, Duke de Berry, grandson of Louis XIV., who died in 1714, aged 28. That of Marie Louise Elizabeth of Orleans, daughter of the Regent of France, wife of Charles Duke of Berry, who died in 1719, aged 24. That of Philippe d'Orleans, Regent during the minority of Louis XV., who died in 1723, aged 49. That of Anne Elizabeth of France, eldest daughter of Louis XIV., who died in 1662, aged 42 days. That of Marie Anne of France, second daughter of Louis XIV., who died in 1664, aged 41 days. That of Philippe, Duke d'Anjou, son of Louis XIV., who died in 1671, aged 3. That of Louis, Duke d'Anjou, brother of the above, who died in 1672, aged 5 months. That of Marie Thérèse of France, third daughter of Louis XIV., who died in 1672, aged 5 years. That of Philippe Charles d'Orleans, who died in 1666, aged 3. That of Alexander Louis of Orleans, Duke of Valois, who died in 1676, aged 3. That of Charles de Berry, Duke of Alençon, who died in 1718, aged 21 days. That of Sophie de France, sixth daughter of Louis XV. and aunt of Louis XVI., who died in 1782, aged 48. That of Louise, daughter of the Count d'Artois, brother of Louis XVI., who died in 1783, aged 7. That of Sophie, Hélène de France, daughter of Louis XVI., who died in 1787, aged 1. That of Louis Joseph Xavier, dauphin, son of Louis XVI., who died in 1789, aged 8.

At 11 o'clock in the forenoon, while Marie Antoinette of Austria, wife of Louis XVI., was being guillotined, the casket containing the remains of Louis XV., who died in 1774, aged 64, was removed and opened. It had rested near the entrance of the vault on a block of stone two feet high, the temporary resting place of the body of the late King, until such time as that of his successor should be brought to the tomb, when it would give place to that of the recently deceased monarch and be assigned its place in the vault. It was taken to the vicinity of the pit in the Valois cemetery. The body when taken from the leaden casket appeared to be entire and well preserved. It had been carefully wrapped and bandaged in folds of linen; but when these were removed there remained no semblance of a human form. Decomposition had been so complete that the remains fell

to pieces, emitting an odor so infectious that it was impossible for the workmen to remain near by. Powder was burned and guns were discharged to purify the air, with but little effect. The putrid remains were hastily covered with quicklime, on a bed of which they were thrown into the pit and covered with lime and clay.

Toward 3 P. M. the same day the "Vault of the Charles," in the chapel so called, was opened. The first casket removed was that of Charles V., who died in 1380, aged 42. Then that of Jeanne de Bourbon, his wife, who died in 1378, aged 40.

The little bones of Charles de France, who died in infancy, were in a leaden casket enclosed in a copper tomb near the foot of the altar. The caskets of two older children of Charles V. were adjacent to his tomb. There were found in the casket of this early ruler of France a well preserved crown of vermeil, a hand of justice in silver and a sceptre five feet long, surmounted with acantha leaves, all of silver gilt. The gold had been so skilfully applied that it had retained its bright lustre. In the casket of Jeanne de Bourbon, his wife, there were found the remains of a crown, a gold ring, bracelets, chains and shoes embroidered in gold and silver.

The remains of Charles V., of his wife and children were placed in the Bourbon pit, which was then filled with earth. A new pit was opened to the left of that of the Bourbon in the same Valois cemetery.

Tuesday morning, October 17, 1793, the work of desecrating the tombs of Charles VI., who died in 1422, aged 54, and that of Isabel of Bavaria, his wife, who died in 1435, aged 48, was begun. There were found in their caskets only dry bones; whatever else of value therein had been stolen. The beautiful marble statues of this King and Queen of France were ruthlessly broken to pieces.

The tombs of Charles VII., who died in 1461, aged 59, and of Marie d'Anjou, his wife, were then violated. There were found in their caskets the remains of a crown and sceptre of silver gilt. In the embalment of Charles VII. quicksilver had been freely used, and it had retained its fluidity. Similar results where bodies had been embalmed with quicksilver during the same and succeeding century had been developed.

In the afternoon of the same day, in the chapel of St. Hyppolyte, the two leaden caskets were opened containing the remains of Blanche de Navarre, second wife of Philippe de Valois, who died in 1391, aged 52, and of Jeanne de France, their daughter, who died in 1371, aged 20.

The vault of Henry II. was next desecrated. It was quite small. From it were first removed one large and one small heart-shaped urn enclosing the remains of hearts. Then four caskets. The first

contained the remains of Queen Marguerite, wife of Henry IV., who died in 1615, aged 62. The second, the remains of François Duke of Alençon, fourth son of Henry II., who died in 1534, aged 30. The third, the remains of François II., who after a short reign died in 1560, aged 17. The fourth, the remains of Elizabeth, Princess of France, daughter of Charles IX., who died in 1578, aged 6.

Later in the day the vault of Charles VII^r. was opened and desecrated. The casket of this monarch, who died in 1498, aged 28, was of lead, supported on a framework of iron. When opened it was found to contain dried bones.

Friday morning, October 18, the desecrating work was resumed in the vault of Henry II., from which was taken four large caskets. The first contained the remains of Henry II., who died in 1550, aged 40. The second, that of Catherine de Medicis, his wife, who died in 1589, aged 70. The third, of Charles IX., who died in 1574, aged 24. The fourth, of Henry III., who died in 1580, aged 38.

There were also found in this vault several other leaden caskets containing bones which were unmarked. Later in the day the laborers descended to the vault of Louis XII., who died in 1515, aged 53, whose casket, as also that of Anne de Bretagne, his wife, who died in 1514, aged 37, were removed and opened. On each of these caskets were copper crowns gilded.

In the choir under the northern window the tomb of Jeanne de France, Queen of Navarre, daughter of Louis X., who died in 1349, aged 38, was desecrated. She had been buried near her father, without casket, the enclosure being slabs of stone. Among the fragments of her bones was found a copper crown gilded. Her father was buried in a similar manner. He had died in 1316, aged 27. On the few bones remaining was found a copper crown and the remains of a sceptre much corroded. His posthumous son, King John, whose reign lasted but a few days, was buried in a tiny leaden casket near by.

Near the tomb of Louis X. had been interred in a stone enclosure of slabs Hughes the Great, Count de Paris, who died in 956, father of Hughes Capet, chief of the race of Capets. All that was left of his remains was a few fragments of bones.

Soon after was found and desecrated, in the centre of the choir, the grave of Charles le Chauve. What was left of his ashes had been enclosed in a small casket. When on his way to Paris from Rome and beyond Mount Cenis, he had been poisoned and died in a village on the borders of Savoy, in 877, aged 54. His body was placed under charge of the Prior of Mantue, in the Diocese of Dijon, whence it was transported to Saint Denis seven years later.

On Saturday, October 19, 1793, the tomb of Philippe Count de

Boulogne, son of Philippe Augustus, who died in 1223, was desecrated. His casket was of stone, in which had been cut a circular *demilune* for the head. The tomb of King Dagobert had been prepared in a similar manner. A similar stone casket enclosed the ashes only of Philippe Augustus, who died in 1223.

A casket hewn out of a solid block of stone with a stone slab for a cover enclosed the ashes of Alphonse de Poitiers, brother of St. Louis, who died in 1271. His hair, however, which was abundant, was well preserved. The slab mentioned was stained like veined marble in white and yellow, caused probably by the strong odors emanating from the decomposing body.

This desecrating work was continued the same day, when the tomb of Louis VIII., father of St. Louis, was violated. He had died in 1226, aged 48. Time had consumed almost every vestige of his remains. There was found only the decayed parts of a sceptre, his crown, which was simply composed of gold cloth with a large *calotte*, which was well preserved. The body had been wrapped in cloth of gold, fragments of which remained, while the outside covering was of soft thick leather, which had remained nearly intact. The chronicler remarks that this was the only instance found where leather had been used for such a purpose. It had apparently been intended to prevent the offensive emanation from the body of the dead King while being transported from Montpensier, in Auvergne, where he had died, to Paris.

The next desecration was that of the tomb of Marguerite de Provence, wife of St. Louis, who died in 1295. Very little was found but ashes.

Next came the tombs of Marie de France, daughter of Charles IV., known in history as Charles *le Bel* (this princess died in 1341), and of her sister, Blanche, Duchess of Orleans, who died in 1392. The sisters had been buried in the tomb without caskets, the inscription on lead found on all the tombs furnishing a brief but imperishable record.

While continuing the search in the choir of the chapel of Notre Dame la Blanche there was found beside the tomb of Louis VIII. the tomb where had been originally placed the body of St. Louis, who died in 1270. This was of smaller proportions than the others. The bones had been removed after his canonization in 1297. The pious chronicler states that the reason the tomb of St. Louis was so small was that his flesh was taken to Sicily, while his bones only were brought to St. Denis.

The sacrilegious work was continued by sounding the soil of the upper part of the choir in search of tombs beneath its surface. The tomb of Philippe le Bel, who died in 1014, aged 46, was found. The

casket was of stone, larger at the head than at foot, covered with a slab. The body had been enclosed in hermetically sealed sheets of lead strongly protected by bars of iron. The skeleton was found to be entire. By it were found a gold ring, a sceptre of copper gilt five feet long, capped with a bunch of leaves, upon which was a bird, all in copper and gilded.

The succeeding desecration was accomplished with the light of lamps. The stone tomb of King Dagobert, who died in 638, was opened. It was more than six feet long and made from a solid block hewn out with a round depression for the head, which had been separated from the body. There was found a wooden case two feet long enclosed in lead and hermetically sealed, which contained the bones of the King and of Nanthilde, his wife, who died in 642. The bones were wrapped in a covering of silk cloth and placed separately in the case, on one side of which on a square of lead was inscribed :

Hic jacet Corpus Dagoberti.

On the other side a similar square was inscribed :

Hic jacet Corpus Nanthildis.

The head of Queen Nanthilde could not be found. The chronicler states this fact and ascribes as the probable reason that it remained in the place of the original sepulture when St. Louis had the remains transferred to the tomb he had erected in the locality above mentioned.

Sunday, October 20, 1793, the work of desecration was resumed. The lead lining the interior of the tomb of Philippe le Bel was removed. Search was made near the tomb of St. Louis for the remains of Marguerite de Provence, his wife, without success. Neither could any trace be found of the remains of Jean Tristan, Count de Nevers, son of St. Louis, who died in 1270, some days before his father, near Carthage, in Africa.

In the chapel of the Charles there was removed the leaden casket containing the remains of Bertrand du Guesclin, who died in 1380. The skeleton was found to be entire, the skull well preserved and the bones perfectly dry. Near by was the tomb of Bureau de La Riviere, who died in 1400. It was three feet in length. The leaden casket was removed. After these researches the entrance to the vault of François I., who died in 1547, aged 52, was discovered. This vault was large and finely arched. It contained six leaden caskets supported by irons: That of François I.; that of Louise de Savoy, his mother, who died in 1531; that of Claudine de France, his wife, who died in 1524, aged 25; that of his son, the dauphin François, who died in 1536, aged 19; that of Charles, Duke of Orleans, his brother, who died in 1544, aged 23, and that of Charlotte, his sister, who died in 1524, aged 8.

The remains in all these caskets were in a state of liquid putrefaction, and when opened emitted an insupportable odor.

The researches were continued in the vicinity of the south window of the choir. A stone casket was found and opened. It contained debris only. It had contained the remains of Pierre Beauclaire, Chamberlain of St. Louis, who died in 1270.

In the afternoon there was found near the iron gate at the south the tomb of Matthieu de Vendome, abbot of Saint Denis, Regent of France under St. Louis and under his son, Philippe le Hardi. Neither casket of stone nor of lead had been used in the burial of this distinguished abbot. He had been laid to rest, probably, according to the rules of his order in a wooden coffin, of which some debris remained. No vestige of his mortal remains could be found. Portions of his abbatial cross of gilded copper and some fragments of gold cloth vestments made it evident that he had been buried in the richest vestments becoming his high position. He had died in 1286, in the first year of the reign of Philippe le Bel.

On Monday, October 21, the desecrating work was resumed. About the centre of the choir a marble slab was removed which covered the entrance to the small vault where, in 1791, had been deposited the bones and ashes of six princes and of one princess of the family of St. Louis, transferred to this church from the abbey of Royoumont, where they had been buried. The bones and ashes were taken from the respective caskets and carried to the Valois cemetery, where they were thrown into the second pit, where what remained of the bodies of Philippe Augustus, Louis VIII., François I. and all of that family had previously been cast.

In the afternoon of Monday a search was commenced in the sanctuary to the left of the principal altar, where were found the caskets of Philippe le Long, who died in 1322; of Charles IV., surnamed le Bel, who died in 1328; of Jeanne d'Evreux, third wife of Charles IV., who died in 1370; of Philippe de Valois, who died in 1350, aged 57; of Jeanne de Bourgogne, wife of Philippe de Valois, who died in 1348, and of King Jean, who died in 1364.

Tuesday, October 22, 1793, the desecrating work was continued. In the chapel of the Charles, bordering the wall of the stairway leading to the rear of the grand altar, two square stone caskets, placed one over the other, were found. The upper one, entirely of stone, enclosed the remains of Arnauld Guillem de Barbazan, first Chamberlain of Charles VII., who died in 1431. The lower one, which was covered and enclosed in sheets of lead, contained the remains of Louis de Sancerre, High Constable of France under Louis VI., who died in 1402, aged 60. His hair had remained intact; it was long and plaited in two well formed tresses.

The stone slab covering the stone tombs of the Abbé Suger and of the Abbé Troon was then removed. The former died in 1151 and the latter in 1221. Fragments of bones and ashes alone remained. The search was continued in the Gospel side of the sanctuary, where, under a large square stone, was found the tombs of Philippe le Long and of others. Before the day's work was concluded the chapel *du Lépreux* was entered and the tomb of Sédille de Sainte-Croix, wife of Jean Pastourelle, Councillor of Charles V., who died in 1380, was opened, but it contained only fragments of bones.

Wednesday, October 23, 1793, the work of desecration was resumed for the discovery of tombs in the sanctuary. The first to be found was that of Philippe de Valois. The casket was of stone lined with lead, closed with a heavy sheet of the same metal, fastened upon iron bars and covered with a long and large flat stone. A copper crown gilded and a sceptre of the same metal surmounted with a bird and also gilded were found among the ashes and debris.

Nearer the altar was found the tomb of Jeanne de Bourgogne, first wife of Philippe de Valois. Among the fragments of bones were found the remains of a distaff and a silver ring.

Thursday, October 24, to the left of the tomb of Philippe de Valois was found that of Charles le Bel, constructed in a similar manner to that of the former. In it was found a crown of silver gilded, a sceptre seven feet long of copper gilded, a silver ring, *un main de justice*, an ebony baton and a leaden pillow on which the head had rested. The body was dry and intact.

Friday, October 25, was found the tomb of Jeanne d'Evreux. It had been broken and its leaden cover detached. Dried bones without the skull only were found. It was apparent that this tomb had been surreptitiously desecrated the night previous. Near by was found the stone tomb of Philippe le Long. The skeleton was found to be well preserved. In it was found a silver crown gilded and ornamented with precious stones; it was in good condition; two lozenge-shaped *agrafes* in silver gilt, a satin cincture with a silver buckle gilded and a sceptre of copper, also gilded. At the foot of the casket was a small stone vase containing the heart of Jeanne de Bourgogne, wife of Philippe de Valois, the inscription on which was on a plate of copper. There was also discovered the tomb of King Jean, who died in England in 1364, aged 66. In it was found a crown, a sceptre, a hand of justice, all of silver gilded. His skeleton was intact.

Some days later the government commissioner appointed to take charge of the lead accruing from these continued desecrations took the workmen to the Carmelite convent to remove the casket of

the Mother Abbess, Madame Louise, daughter of Louis XV., who died in 1787, aged 50. The casket was taken to the Valois cemetery and the remains of this saintly woman were thrown into the pit where already had been cast the bones and ashes of the most distinguished dead of Catholic France.

On the night of September 12, 1793, by order of the government, in presence of the commissioner of the municipality of St. Denis, was removed the treasure of the abbey. The shrines, reliquaries, all the rich ornaments of the altars, the sacred vessels of gold, etc., were placed in large wooden boxes and taken in wagons to the convention, accompanied by the commissioner and his escort in great form and state.

January 18, 1794, the tomb of Francis I. was demolished. It was easy to open that of Marguerite, Countess of Flanders, daughter of Philippe le Long and wife of Count Louis of Flanders, who died in 1382, aged 76. Her remains reposed in a well built vault in a leaden casket, supported by iron bars. Some well preserved bones and the debris of chestnut boards were all that was found in the casket.

But the desecrating agents did not succeed in finding the sepulchre of Cardinal de Retz, known as the coadjutor, who died in 1679, aged 66; nor of several other distinguished personages.

No better illustration could be given of the animus of the French Revolution nor of its communistic spirit than that furnished by the account of the desecration of St. Denis. It would seem that the Frenchmen composing the Revolutionary Assembly of 1793 had denationalized themselves; that they had forgotten that France had had a glorious history and a line of monarchs more illustrious than any other kingdom in Europe during the history of civilization.

It is difficult to believe, however, that men of intelligence, as well as of education, such as were most of the members of the Revolutionary Assembly of France at this period, were oblivious of the history of their nation; while it is apparent that their craze for the destruction of the collateral evidences which directed attention to the eminence of the royal families of France during twelve centuries, intimately connected as these evidences were with the religion of Catholic France, had obliterated from their hearts that feeling of patriotism characteristic of most true Frenchmen.

RICHARD R. ELLIOTT.

Detroit, Michigan.

THE TRIALS AND NEEDS OF THE SOCIETY OF ST. VINCENT DE PAUL.

SURELY the spread throughout the civilized world of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul has been one of the most remarkable events of the past century to those interested in the progress of the Church as well as to the student of organized charity. It is not proposed to repeat the thrice-told tale of its origin, but only to point out the fundamental facts that it was founded by a group of zealous young Catholic students in reply to the taunt, "Show us the works of the Catholic Church." Four facts stand out: the founders were laymen, they were young, they were men of education, they chose works of charity as the evidence of the Divine origin and mission of the Church. How well inspired was their choice, how wonderful their success is not to be discussed here, but did space permit, the story of the development of their works from visiting the poor at their homes to the carrying on of charitable works of all kinds would be well worth the telling. It is particularly to be noted that they worked not merely to relieve bodily suffering, but to make the poor better in all ways, and that the spiritual works of charity were prominent in their plan. The purpose of this writing is the more humble and practical one of considering how the Society now stands among us in this country, what are its trials and its needs.¹

That the Society has flourished and is flourishing in this country are facts concerning which, happily, there is no dispute; but this is not to say that its condition is as good as it might be, nor that it gives assurance of its fitness to meet new requirements which the changing of the old order of things is steadily and by no means slowly thrusting upon it.

Even so short a time as forty years ago² the condition of our Catholic laymen was very different from what it is now. When the Society was established those who formed the nucleus were neither young nor college-bred, but plain men, many of very moderate education, of the class that was most likely to be useful to the priest in the various odds and ends of non-spiritual parochial work. Among them, providentially, were most admirable characters, zealous, self-forgetful and actuated truly by the love of God and their neighbor. It is but natural that in their readiness to help they assumed many duties quite different from those contemplated by Ozanam and his

¹ The writer's personal knowledge of the society in this country is limited to New England, but he believes that the same conditions are at least very general. It is needless to say that he is writing simply as an individual, not as an officer of the society. ² The first conference in New England, that of St. James', Boston, was aggregated April 18, 1862.

associates. Often the president of a conference was the sexton, and the members helped in the work. Indeed, in not a few places this came to be considered as practically one of his chief duties. Besides this, the conference relieved the pastor of the care of the poor, for which he could ill spare the time, and conducted it charitably, discreetly and in accordance with his wishes. Who shall say that this is not good work? But the work went far beyond this. Spiritual good followed material relief, and in spite of deficiencies, the spirit of the Society was supreme.

A great change has come over social conditions since that time. Municipal help to the poor has spread and increased wonderfully. It is generally distributed with no sectarian discrimination. If some one or two good old souls of a past generation left certain sums for the benefit of Protestant widows and spinsters, the statement that the religious question does not enter into municipal relief is none the less practically true. Should the Society of St. Vincent de Paul suddenly disappear from the face of the earth, it would probably require not even a year for affairs in this community to be so readjusted that the merely material wants of the poor might be well met. On the one hand, cities and towns might give more; on the other, the money which directly or indirectly comes to the conferences from the parish priests might be distributed through other channels.

But would there be no loss? On the contrary, the loss would be frightful; first of all to the members. Their loss in opportunity to do good works, to help to save souls as well as bodies, to win graces, to gain indulgences, can be reckoned by no human bookkeeper. The loss to the poor, though not in dollars and cents, would be equally appalling; the words of kindness and encouragement, the Christian sympathy, the baptisms of children, the reformation of sinners, the families held together, the tottering faith supported. Who shall estimate the loss were these things left undone?

Two deductions come from these considerations: First, that the aim and works of the Society are essentially supernatural, done for the love of God, our own sanctification and that of our neighbor; secondly, that with changing conditions the importance of almsgiving is less and that there is more and more demand for works requiring greater intelligence. This is the era of scientific charity; the name is new; but though St. Vincent de Paul would have expressed it differently, the idea of well-thought-out instead of emotional charity is one of his own.

The works of the Society are constantly increasing, and as implied above, changing in scope. The care of children was very dear to St. Vincent de Paul, and the Society has much to do for them. True, there are institutions many and good under the care of Catholic

bodies, but the trouble is to see that the little ones are brought to their sheltering arms. The dangers from outside societies are great. Apart from those whose *raison d'être* is proselytism, there are many conducted by those who without the blessing of faith themselves cannot understand that the faith of a Catholic child, its only possession, is also a very precious one, for which worldly advantages are a most unfair exchange. Yet justice, leaving policy aside, requires us to admit that they mean no wrong, and to so deal with them that while we protect the rights of the helpless we do not quarrel. This is work of a high order, requiring not only patience and devotion, but familiarity with laws and the tact to meet great and unexpected difficulties. Beside the qualities needed in the actual conduct of affairs, there are those requisite to shape the line of policy. The work is both engrossing and very delicate; no one engaged in it will suffer from mental stagnation.

Thus it is inevitable that our members should come into contact with those of other creeds, and most desirable that they should meet them with credit. For this purpose they must meet them as equals.

It is best to admit frankly that the great majority of our members are not up to the requirements of this work. Let me try to make myself perfectly plain on this point. Neither riches nor education are necessary to make admirable members. Some of the best I have ever known earned their bread by manual labor. The personal friendship of some of these has been and is very dear to me. Were all such as they, the Society would be very different from what it is and much better. But even then there would be the admission to make that there are works both within and without the Society for which they have not the education. This is no more a reflection on them than it would be to say that they are not clad in purple and fine linen. They have what is far better, true and humble hearts; but it does not follow that there is not need of men fitted for higher work. The Catholic body is much stronger than it was in the early days of the Society amongst us. Apart from accessions through conversions, the sons of former members have grown up with much better education than their fathers. There are large numbers of young Catholics rising to distinction in the professions and in business. Those in our ranks are relatively few. We have tried to get them, and some have accepted the invitation. Why not more?

Let us defer the answer to this question till it has been shown why, apart from the needs of the Society itself, young men of education should be urged to enter its ranks. First of all for their own good. It is an axiom that no one, be his fortuitous advantages of wealth, learning or position what they may, can give anything to the Society of St. Vincent de Paul that shall in the least equal what he will gain

from it if he be a faithful member. But there is another side to the question, the good of the cause. It was for this that the Society was originally founded in France, and founded by young laymen. The Church does not consist of the clergy alone, but of all the faithful. For the symmetrical and perfect development of an organization it is necessary that all the parts should do their share of the work. A great deal has been done for the laity to keep them to their duties and to protect them from temptation, but they have themselves done very little, except as individuals. The remarks of Bishop O'Connell, of Portland, before the Catholic Union of Boston during the past summer on lay coöperation, and the interest which they have raised show that the time for meeting this problem is at hand. There is no question of political action. Politics are rigidly excluded from the Society of St. Vincent de Paul. Moreover, it is not through politics that the influence of the Church is to spread, but by our fellow countrymen being made to see it as an influence for good and enlightenment. Let the younger generation of educated Catholics do here what Ozanam and his friends did in France.

This brings us to a very difficult and delicate question which practically lies at the root of the matter. It is the relation of the parish priest to the conference. The question should not be avoided were it possible to do so, for the support of the parish priests is essential to the movement. At present there is great variation in the relations of the pastors and the conferences. As a rule the best conferences are those that are in close touch with the pastor, who is also the spiritual director, who makes it a point to attend the meetings frequently and who is familiar with the regulations and the spirit of the Society. As a rule the worst are those in which the Pastor takes no interest. Almost equally unsatisfactory to one having in mind the traditions of the Society is another type of conference which nevertheless may do fair work. It is that of which the members are but the agents of the pastor, with no more initiative or responsibility than errand boys.

It may be asked, "What coöperation can there be with conferences constituted as many are?" And the answer must be, "None!" This, however, is not to say that coöperation is undesirable, but only that the conference is not what it should be. That this question has presented itself elsewhere is apparent from recent remarks of the president of the Particular Council of Liverpool, in which he argues against the fear on the part of the pastors that the conference if too progressive may become a source of discord or confusion in the parish, being in fact *imperium in imperio*. That some distrust exists is hardly to be doubted. That it is at times justified is probably not to be denied. Are many of our conferences fit to be trusted by them-

selves, especially if they should undertake work out of the beaten track? Some indeed are, but, unfortunately, more are not. What does this show but the crying need of the infusion of new blood?

A crucial point in the discussion is this: admitting that the Society is a lay society, and assuming that it is composed of good material, what on the one hand is the limit to the activity of the conference? and on the other what is the limit to the pastor's responsibility for it? It is hard to define these limits for all cases and under all circumstances, but a general answer should present no difficulty. Theoretically one might say that unless the conference should so lose its head as to introduce some custom prejudicial to faith and morals it can hardly go wrong in its charitable work; but practically its activity must be much more restricted. The conference must respect the wishes and the policy of the ordinary and of the rector in all matters. Catholic instinct, good feeling and common sense will be sufficient guides. The second question would be hard indeed to answer were the conference perfect, doing its work as well as it could be done, neglecting nothing it should undertake and aspiring to nothing it should not meddle with. But here below things do not go in that way, and the influence of the priest to guide, encourage and restrain, all without trenching on the rights of the president, cannot be overestimated. It is under such conditions that lay coöperation will be best developed, and that those most fitted for the work will be the most anxious for the chance to do it.

Finally we come to the answer to the question why so few of the more educated class have joined the Society. There is reason to fear that in some localities the conference has been looked upon as practically a body of under-sextons, whose duties consist in standing at the church door, collecting money and being generally useful. It should be needless to say that none of these works, meritorious as they are, form any part of the duty of a member of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul. It is unfortunate that such an idea should have spread abroad, for it no doubt has kept many away who were capable of higher work.

Another reason, which to some extent may have arisen from a wrong idea of the Society, is that young men of-standing have felt that they were not wanted. They have never appreciated that the opportunity was offered them to work for the glory of God's Church by serving His poor. They have the excuse of the laborers who had stood all day idle, that no man had hired them. There is no hint in the parable that these words were not said in good faith. Doubtless the excuse may be honestly offered by many of our young Catholics whose labor is most needed.

THOMAS DWIGHT.

Harvard Medical School.

HISTORY OF EDUCATION.¹

THE history of an idea, a movement, a purpose, as running through the life of a people, commonly falls into that manner of presentation which has come to be called the philosophy of history. It makes up a chapter or a paragraph in the general philosophy of history. It will approach the more closely to the fundamental philosophy in proportion as the idea or movement is one that springs more directly and spontaneously from the essentials of humanity and from the primary impulses of human nature. And the philosophy, again, will be all the more fundamental as it touches more immediately the question of the origin, development and destiny of the individuals of the human race, universally. To write such history is to write the metaphysics of history. To write such history correctly it is necessary to bring to the work intellectual insight into facts and principles, clear, deep and accurate, as well as the inexorable will which orders judgment to be given strictly as things weigh in the delicate balance of blind justice.

The education of an individual is the development, the unfolding of an individual humanity body and soul. It is something physical, mental and moral. In each of these orders it implies a continuous supply of material for the new and higher exercise of the powers developed. The writing of a history of the processes which have been excogitated for the purpose of furthering human development would be a stupendous undertaking. M. Gabriel Compayré has undertaken to execute such a writing in his two books, "Critical History of Educational Theories in France Since the Sixteenth Century" and "History of Pedagogy." The first mentioned, on educational theories in France (two volumes), is the more important work. The second, a history of pedagogy, is an abridgment of the first work, with additions, tending to make it a more general history and to render it serviceable as a manual in classes of pedagogy.

M. Compayré does not need an introduction to the American public. His "History of Pedagogy," translated into English, has been in the hands of American students for fifteen years. His contribution to "The Great Educators" series, "Abelard and the Origin and Early History of Universities," appeared (first, as translated into English) in 1893.

The writer has been asked to give an estimate of the value of M. Compayré's essay at the history of educational aims and methods. Whole volumes might be written in discussion of what M. Com-

¹ *Histoire critique des doctrines de l'éducation en France depuis le XVI^e siècle*, par G. Compayré, 2 vol. Paris, 1879. *Histoire de la Pédagogie*, par Gabriel Compayré: quinzième édition, Paris, 1901.

payré has or has not said concerning men and methods that enter into the history of education. We can do nothing more, here, than to test M. Compayré's authority as a historian. To keep within due limits we shall select but two cases for investigation, one from the first book and one from the second. The first book is better provided with references which allow the reader an opportunity to determine the value of statements by going to the sources indicated. In the second book, the references are not so well provided, particularly where the author expresses condemnation and notably in the additions concerning men and events that preceded the sixteenth century. In the first book, therefore, we shall examine a passage or two which will permit us to refer to the authority. In the second book we shall consider one assertion which is presented without a reference. In both cases we shall select matter which may be of general interest. The first book is definitely concerned with education in France. We shall take from it, therefore, for examination, references to things which are of a more cosmopolitan nature, and from the second book an assertion which will suggest some broad fact in the history of education. Finally, applying the common test for justice in a historian, we shall make our selections from matter concerning methods—or men—to which the author exhibits himself continuously hostile. These two studies will suffice to set forth the value of writings in which the reader naturally expects to be addressed in a spirit of equity and discretion.

As one of the main objects of both works is to impress upon the mind of the reader the unfitness of the education given by the Jesuits, we may examine two references which the author makes to a well-known book, the "Ratio Studiorum," an outline of class matter and methods common in the Society of Jesus. There is in the "Ratio Studiorum" the following instruction for professors of philosophy (Rule 12): "*Summopere conetur Aristotelicum textum bene interpretari, in eoque nihilo minus operae quam in quaestionibus collocet.*" M. Compayré cites this rule, and we must give him credit for having transcribed the whole of it. The translation of the rule is: "He [the professor] must try very earnestly to interpret the text of Aristotle well, and take no less pains with this interpretation than with the questions," *i. e.*, under discussion. Here is the explanation of this rule as given in French by M. Compayré: "*C'est la philosophie d'Aristote amoindrie que le 'Ratio Studiorum' propose aux élèves de la Société. De plus, il est bien entendu que le professeur expliquera les textes, non avec liberté, avec critique, mais avec un esprit de docilité aveugle et, comme dit le règlement, en attachant au sens des mots autant d'importance qu'aux questions elles-mêmes.*" (t. I., p. 196). This, translated, will read: "It is the philosophy of Aristotle minimized

that the *Ratio Studiorum* proposes for the students of the Society. Moreover, it is well understood that the professor shall explain the text not with liberty and critically, but in a spirit of blind docility and, as the regulation says, attaching as much importance to the meaning of the words as to the questions themselves." Two pages further on he expands this assertion into the following: "*Dans le 'Ratio' on recommande d'accorder autant et peut-être plus d'attention à l'explication grammaticale du texte qu'à l'analyse des pensées.*" "The *Ratio* recommends that as much—that perhaps more attention should be given to the grammatical explanation of the text than to the analysis of the thought." (p. 198.) Now, any one who has ever read Aristotle knows that he has given us the closest piece of writing that has ever been made. To "interpret his text well" is not the same thing as teaching grammar. To interpret his text well means to give a very exhaustive commentary; and no commentary is possible without a thorough and precise interpretation of the text. If M. Compayré had looked into some of the Jesuit commentaries on Aristotle, as Fonseca, Maurus, Toledo, he would have learned something about scientific interpretation. On the discussion of the questions involved Maurus has left us three volumes from his class work. In the fragments of Toledo we have one hundred and ninety-two discussions of the matter. And in what M. Compayré slightly calls "the Latin paraphrase of Saint Thomas" (t. I., p. 195) the commentary is from five to six times longer than the corresponding passage of Aristotle.

To this we must add that the rule cited is three hundred years old. It still stands in the *Ratio*; but the *Ratio* is a thing so pliable that the text of Aristotle is nowhere used in any school of philosophy of the Society to-day. At the time when the rule was written there was available no other text of any completeness. But how soon the construction of adequate texts was begun may be seen by consulting the metaphysics of Suarez. When Aristotle was used as a class textbook, the first and essential thing for the professor to do was to make the true meaning of a very difficult writer understood, in order to approve, correct and supplement. The present writer attended lectures on philosophy given by Jesuit professors during four years. In no case was the text of Aristotle used as the basis of an exposition. The number of philosophies (ranging from one to seven volumes) published by Jesuit professors during the past fifty years, and containing the lectures given in the classes, would make a considerable library. These works represent the actual teaching, and no one of them is a commentary on Aristotle. We should imagine that it must be difficult to write a Critical History of Education when one is obliged to invent the history.

In another instance, citing from the same *Ratio Studiorum*, the author of the Critical History has not been so happy. The eleventh rule for the professors of philosophy as given in the *Ratio* says: "*In metaphysica quaestiones de Deo et intelligentiis, quae omnino, aut magno opere pendent ex veritatibus divina fide traditis, praetereantur.*" M. Compayré disembowels this sentence, sews it up again, and presents it as continuous and complete in these words: "*In metaphysica quaestiones de Deo et intelligentiis praetereantur.*" (t. I., p. 196.) The mutilated cadaver of a sentence he thus renders for the French reader: "*De même dans la métaphysique, on supprime quelques-unes des questions les plus intéressantes et les plus essentielles, comme, par exemple, tout ce qui concerne l'existence de Dieu et la nature de ses attributs.*"

Now let us do the three sentences into English; and first the French of M. Compayré. "In metaphysics, too," says he, "they suppress some of the most interesting and most essential questions, as, for example, all that concerns the existence of God and the nature of His attributes."

The translation of the eleventh rule given is this: "In metaphysics those questions concerning God and intelligences which depend entirely or for the most part upon truths consigned to us by divine faith are to be passed over."

The true translation of M. Compayré's mutilated presentation of the rule is: "In metaphysics questions concerning God and intelligences are to be passed over."

Now, let us see what he has done. In the first place he has disemboweled the text of the rule. There is no other expression to correctly indicate the character of the surgical operation. In the second place he has given an utterly false and most unscholarly description of the etymological corpse so provided for demonstration. The rule says plainly to those who understand the nature and scope of metaphysics and the import of philosophical terminology, that the professor of metaphysics must stick closely to metaphysics. It says that when there is question of God and of the intelligences he must not base his reasoning upon divine revelation. Hence all questions which belong solely to supernatural theology, as being based upon those truths of divine revelation which do not lie also within the sphere of natural knowledge are to be left out of the metaphysics. Such, for instance, would be the question of the Trinity. The provision is a wise one and leaves the metaphysics in the sphere of pure reason, excluding everything for which revelation would have to be brought in as a support; and no matter how anxious the professor might be to enlarge, it cuts him off from digressions into the science of theology. It does not affect the metaphysics. It is simply a warning to draw the line at the proper place. M. Compayré says

that it "suppresses some of the most interesting and most essential questions of metaphysics, for example, all that concerns the existence of God and the nature of His attributes." To see how untrue is this explanation, I wheel my book-case and take the first book on the subject that comes in view. It happens to be Lahousse, *Natural Theology*, the third volume in the course of special metaphysics, large 8vo, pages XII—416. Looking at the index we find nine chapters with the following headings:

C. I. The Existence of God.

C. II. The Essence of God and the Attributes in General.

C. III. The Negative Attributes of God.

Then follow five chapters on the positive attributes; and finally the ninth chapter on the attributes considered specially on the supposition of the fact of creation. I turn my book-case once more, and the first book I see this time is the *Natural Theology* belonging to the Stonyhurst series of philosophy. It is a work of XII—480 pages. It is divided into three books. Here are the titles:

Book I. Of the Existence of God.

Book II. The Divine Attributes.

Book III. The Action of God Upon This World.

The "interesting and essential questions of the existence of God and the nature of His attributes" receive a special treatment which covers 343 pages, and the third Book draws the logical consequences from the fact of creation. These two indices represent what is found in every Jesuit work upon the subject and what is discussed in every Jesuit class-room in the third year of metaphysics. Now, to say in face of this that the direction given to the professors of philosophy "suppresses some of the most interesting and most essential questions of metaphysics, for example, all that concerns the existence of God and the nature of His attributes," gives us what we can diagnose as nothing else than a literary paralysis. As M. Compayré does not instance those other "most interesting and most essential questions of metaphysics" which are "suppressed," we do not feel ourselves called upon to rehearse the whole curriculum.

But, what about those "intelligences?" According to the regulation, the professor is told to leave out of the metaphysics theses concerning God and the intelligences which he could not substantiate without falling back wholly or in great part upon revelation. According to M. Compayré's understanding these intelligences are the attributes of God. He mutilates the rule into this shape: "*In metaphysica quaestiones de Deo et intelligentiis praetereantur*," and he interprets this into the suppression of "all that concerns the existence of God and the nature of His attributes." We have never heard or read, nor has any one else heard or read that any one besides M.

Compayré and those who trust in him have ever taken the word *intelligentia*, or as it is here the plural *intelligentiae*, to stand for the attributes of God or the nature of His attributes. *Intelligentia* means intelligence; and *intelligentiae* means intelligences. Now, intelligences are intelligences, that is to say, purely spiritual beings, not embodied spirit as man is. The angels are intelligences, and as we know nothing about the intelligences except from revelation, the subject does not belong to metaphysics. We trust that the author's tutelary spirit will overlook this absence of recognition.

In eight words, therefore, of M. Compayré we have: 1, Butchery of the text; 2, Falsification of the facts; 3, Ignorance of the terminology. This ought to be sufficient preface to the ante-mortem elegy which he pens for the grave-stone of the Society.²

"Voltaire said of these teachers 'the Fathers taught me nothing but Latin and nonsense.'" (151.)

"The Jesuits have never written anything on the principles and objects of education." (152.)

"In no instance have they founded a primary school." (153.)

"The truth is that the Jesuits neither desire nor love the instruction of the people." (153.)

"No account is made of modern history." (155.)

"The sciences and philosophy are involved in the same disdain as history." (155.)

"In all things the Jesuits are the enemies of progress." (155.)

"Intolerant of everything new, they would arrest the progress of the human mind and render it immovable." (155.)

"As to intellectual education, as they understand it, it is wholly artificial and superficial." (159.)

". . . the barren teaching and formal instruction of the Jesuits." (202.)

"The greatest educational event of the eighteenth century, before the expulsion of the Jesuits and the events of the French Revolution, is the publication of the *Émile*." (303.)

"Even in religion, the Company of Jesus is charged with substituting for the sacred texts, books of devotion composed by the Fathers." (376.)

"Finally, the Company of Jesus maintained in the schools the teaching of moral casuistry; it encouraged bigotry and superstition." (376.)

Well, well, let us murmur softly our "*hic jacet*," *çi-gît*, and retire. Perhaps we may find solace if we read over again the words which an English gentleman of letters, the amiable Andrew Lang, wrote to

² These and all further citations are from "The History of Pedagogy" (English Translation). Figures in parenthesis refer to numbered paragraphs.

the *Pilot* (October 12, 1901). Says Mr. Lang: "We need not look far to see why the Jesuits are disliked. . . . It is natural to mankind to dislike and distrust intellectual people, and this is a wise provision of nature. Now the Jesuits are, or aim at being intellectual. We need look no further, that is how they get themselves disliked. And here my apology breaks down. They are clever, educated men, I cannot deny it, but then they have redeeming qualities."

We may now turn to the second point in our study, an affirmation made in the second work, without a reference. The affirmation needs to be introduced by a restatement of certain historical facts. About the middle of the sixth century a boy named Gall, or Calliche, went to school to Columbanus at Benchore. At the end of the century when Columbanus undertook his wonderful missionary excursions on the Continent, Gall accompanied him. In 612 Gall fell ill at Bregenz. Columbanus leaving him there journeyed on to Italy. Each of these men has left his name upon a city of to-day. In 613, beside the little Steinach which flows into the lake of Constance, Gall planted a Cross in the wilderness, and with two companions, Mang and Theodore, felled the forest trees and built some cells. This cell of the Celtic student was the beginning of a monastery and a city which form a landmark in the chronicle of the human race. To-day the chapel over the tomb of Gall shows us where, within a dozen years of thirteen centuries ago, he raised his rude Cross beside the Steinach. He died towards the middle of the seventh century, at the age of 95; and nearly the whole of Switzerland and of south-western Germany owes its civilization to his cabin in the woods. The cell grew into a monastery and a colony. There lived the learned Kero who has given us one of the earliest monuments of the German language. The names of Notker, Ekkehard, Ratpert, Tutilo, Hartmot and Iso were among its glories in the first centuries of the middle ages. In and around the monastery every art was practiced. Music, painting, sculpture, architecture, the German language, were cultivated with the diligence of enthusiasts. There were schools for the monks and schools for the people; and the wonder of the monastery was its scriptorium, upon which for the educated reader we need not delay.

If we have referred to St. Gall's it is simply because it stands there to-day as a monument whose history is typical of an educational work that was being done in the middle ages. Off the western north coast of Gaul there was in those days an island known as Scotia (Hibernia), and for full five centuries that island was simply a nest of schools. The Roman eagles had never been planted on the shores of Scotia. When the Roman Empire went down under the ava-

lanche of Huns, Alans, Goths, Franks and Norsemen, that island remained throughout those awful centuries a peaceful home of letters until the coming of the Dane. It was the school of Europe. And whilst the work of blood and ravage was rife upon the continent its scholars went forth by the thousands to tame the tribes and to bring to them the blessings of religion, of letters and of the arts of civilized life. Their work was swept away, but they began it over again, and they did not desist until there was laid firmly the basis of our modern civilization. The story of the Irish schools is not a myth; and the tales that are told of the thousands and thousands of students are not fables. It is not necessary to cite authorities on this matter. However, let us take one; and let it be the *Encyclopædia Britannica*. We choose it, first, because it will not be regarded with suspicion; and, secondly, because it is within the reach of everybody.

Of Iona, the little island off the coast of Northern Britain, where Columbkille founded one of his schools, it says: "For many centuries it was much frequented on account of its facilities for learning." (Art. *Iona*.)

In the Article on Ireland we have the following: "The real work of the early Irish missionaries in converting the pagans of Britain and central Europe and sowing the seeds of culture there, has been overlooked when not wilfully misrepresented." In the same Article the Irish schools are designated "a refuge of learning in the seventh and eighth centuries."

The article on Celtic Literature has this, concerning the Irish language: "If all the existing glossaries, old and new, were added together, we should have at least 30,000 words besides those in printed dictionaries, a richness of vocabulary unequaled perhaps by any living language. Among the old glossaries we may mention that attributed to Cormac Mac Cuilennain, king and Bishop of Cashel, who was killed in 903, as an early attempt at comparative etymology, the author referring to Latin, Greek, Hebrew, Norse and British."

Of the Annals of Ulster the writer says: "The Annals . . . are of special importance because the book contains notices of comets, eclipses and other natural phenomena, which appear to have been recorded by eye witnesses as is proved by the day and hour of the eclipse of the sun on the 1st May 664 being correctly recorded."

Finally: "Celtic literature, though it has no great masterpiece of its own to point to, has exercised a considerable amount of influence on the creation of modern European literature." And the writer, speaking of "The Wandering of St. Brendan," "The Purgatory of St. Patrick" and "The Vision of Tundale," and referring to Villari's work on the legends of the *Divina Commedia*, says: "These three

legends which are to be found in every European language in the middle ages constitute three out of the five main sources of the plot of Dante's great poem."

We have dwelt upon this subject of the Irish schools and their radiations into the Continent because of the manner in which our author has dealt with the same facts. Let us cite the entire paragraph 76, page 67.

"76. INTELLECTUAL FEEBLENESS OF THE MIDDLE AGE. If the early doctors of the Church occasionally expressed some sympathy for profane letters, it is because, in their youth, before having received baptism, they had themselves attended the pagan schools. But these schools once closed, Christianity did not open others, and, after the fourth century, a profound night enveloped humanity. The labor of the Greeks and Romans was as though it never had been. The past no longer existed. Humanity began anew. In the fifth century, Apollinaris Sidonius declares that 'the young no longer study, that teachers no longer have pupils, and that learning languishes and dies.' Later, Lupus of Ferrieres, the favorite of Louis the Pious and Charles the Bald, writes that the study of letters had almost ceased. In the early part of the eleventh century, the Bishop of Laon, Adalberic, asserts that 'there is more than one bishop who cannot count the letters of the alphabet on his fingers.' In 1291, of all the monks in the convent of Saint Gall, there was not one who could read and write. It was so difficult to find notaries public that acts had to be passed verbally. The barons took pride in their ignorance. Even after the efforts of the twelfth century, instruction remained a luxury for the common people; it was the privilege of the ecclesiastics, and even they did not carry it very far. The Benedictines confess that the mathematics were studies only for the purpose of calculating the date of Easter."

The value of a history lies as much in the correctness of the impression left upon the reader's mind as in the strict exactness of dates and proper names recorded. The dates and names fade from memory. The judgment passed in the reading is more indelible; it is a spiritual act; it involves reflection; it is a personal estimate based upon principles already fixed and become habitual in application. So that what we call impression is rather mental expression in the judgment of conviction or opinion. The details of the impression may often be confused and blurred as responding to the objective presentation which produces it; but the expression will be sharp, definite; distinct. Now take the above paragraph and apply it *al fresco*, to the fresh young mind, for which, indeed, this book has been intended and to which it is applied under compulsion. What must be the result? Ask any one who has been a student of history and

of *educational impressions*—a something that is now almost ignored and despised in the craze for new mechanical methods in pedagogy. There is no one who knows history and the philosophy of insinuation who will not see that the paragraph is specially constructed to produce the impression out of which the young mind will form almost necessarily an absolutely false judgment. And in the case of those who are actually using this book, the judgment so formed will be permanent since there is not one in one hundred of them who will ever go further to correct the distorted impression.

Neither is the impression corrected by what is given in the succeeding paragraph. The author has the bold talent of branding upon the young reader's mind, at the outset, his bias and prejudice; and the little sprinkling of soothing powder which he sometimes afterwards adds, only serves to perpetuate the scar. Hence what follows the above citation does not obliterate the impression, but rather reënforces it by a semblance of fairness. The author continues:

"77. CAUSES OF THE IGNORANCE OF THE MIDDLE AGE.—What were the permanent causes of that situation which lasted for ten centuries? The Catholic Church has sometimes been held responsible for this. Doubtless the Christian doctors did not always profess a very warm sympathy for intellectual culture. Saint Augustine had said: '*It is the ignorant who gain possession of heaven (indocti coelum rapiunt).*' Saint Gregory the Great, a Pope of the sixth century, declared that he would blush to have the holy word conform to the rules of grammar. Too many Christians, in a word, confounded ignorance with holiness. Doubtless, towards the seventh century, the darkness still hung thick over the Christian Church. Barbarians invaded the Episcopate, and carried with them their rude manners. Doubtless, also, during the feudal period the priest often became soldier, and remained ignorant. It would, however, be unjust to bring a constructive charge against the Church of the middle age, and to represent it as systematically hostile to instruction. Directly to the contrary, it is the clergy who, in the midst of the general barbarism, preserved some vestiges of the ancient culture. The only schools of that period are the episcopal and claustral schools, the first annexed to the bishops' palaces, the second to the monasteries. The religious orders voluntarily associated manual labor with mental labor. As far back as 530, Saint Benedict founded the convent of Monte Cassino, and drew up statutes which made reading and intellectual labor a part of the daily life of the monks."

This ought to be sufficient to indicate the spirit of the writer. After the false impressions created and the false judgment formed upon the

reading of this consecutive matter it would be necessary to give to the young people of the normal schools a course of true history which they will never get. It is the part of writers such as M. Compayré to make false assertions and, contrary to all known processes of justice to throw upon the accused the burden of disproof. This makes disproof almost an impossibility for lack of time. For each assertion demands a complete rehearsal of the subject to which it refers. In view of this we selected the single sentence referring to the monastery of St. Gall's in order to introduce the summary given above. It seems to us that the preservation of letters and of the literary spirit through centuries by one people and under circumstances so unique in the history of man, deserved to enter into a history of pedagogy. It might be that one could not find many data for studying class-room methods; but neither does the author limit himself to this kind of study, as is clear from the long passage just cited. A reference, and a reference full of reverence is due to the great historic fact. But the author boils down the entire story absolutely and exclusively into a single sentence. And this is the sentence: "In 1291 of all the monks in the convent of St. Gall, there was not one who could read and write."

But 1291! It is a wonder that there was a monk, at all, in the monastery in 1291. This was the end of that terrible thirteenth century. It was the year of the fall of Acre; and within the one hundred years had taken place five of the eight Crusades. It was the time when men who were born to be leaders became crusaders instead of becoming monks. It was the day of Guelph and Ghibelline, with St. Gall's in the middle of it. A prince of the Empire was the abbot of St. Gall's. And a prince of the Empire at that hour might be more of a fighter than a writer. A decline had already begun at St. Gall's in the beginning of the twelfth century, when the rival Emperors Henry IV. and Rudolf each simultaneously imposed his own abbot on the monastery. From the year 1216 the abbot was a prince of the Empire. The Canons of the Monastery were all nobles. They were thrust into sacred orders. They had no common life. They lived in their own houses and took the benefices; and they wore no mark of monastic profession. They hunted and banqueted and went to war. Things went on until the prelacy fell into the hands of Henry of Gundelfingen, who had no sacred orders, and whom Felix Hammerlin of Zurich describes as a tonsured mule. Henry was obliged to resign the abbacy at the Council of Constance. A renovation of Spirit then began and was kept up until 1529, when the place was devastated by the Swiss followers of Martin Luther. We need never be afraid of the whole truth. But the five prior centuries of St. Gall's glory and her later history, the history of

the Iona of Columba, the history of the island of schools which was universally known as the island of doctors, the history of the light radiating into the barbarous continent—all this we should be ashamed to present to the teaching fraternity in the bald sentence, that "In 1291 of all the monks in the convent of St. Gall, there was not one who could read and write."³ And now we are going to take, further, the privilege of denying outright the assertion of the author. The most that we can do for him in extenuation is to presume that he did not know the terminology of what he was writing about. We have not space to discuss the occasion of the author's error in this little sentence into which he has squeezed the history of so many centuries. But we have said enough to show how unfit and unsafe his book is to be employed as a manual for purposes of history—in particular, the history of pedagogy. The illustration which we have given of the manner in which corrections will have to be made point to the difficulty which must attend the use of such a book in the class-room, a difficulty which involves little short of a detailed course of lectures upon universal history. The straightening out of the two passages cited above would serve admirably for the matter of a year's lectures to a competent professor.

Enough has been said, then, to indicate the historical value of the work of M. Compayré. His personal loves and hates are given a verbal emphasis which has never been recognized as admissible in the style proper to the historian. There are four things that he likes: Protestantism, the Jansenists, the French Revolution, and the suppression of liberty in teaching. There are four things that he does not like: the Church, the monks of the middle ages, the Jesuits and the syllogism. A few extracts will exhibit his mind. He says:

"Christianity at the first could not be a good school for a practical and humane system of education. . . . Individual initiative, if called into play, on the one hand by the fundamental doctrines of Christianity, was stifled, on the other, under the domination of the Church." (70.)

"Of the celebrated doctors who by their erudition and eloquence, if not by their taste, made illustrious the beginning of Christianity, some were jealous mystics and sectaries in whose eyes philosophical curiosity was a sin, and the love of letters a heresy." (71.)

"The syllogism . . . was the natural instrument of an age of faith. . . . It was not then a question of original thinking." (82.)

³ We may remark that the American translator has erred in his rendering of this little sentence. M. Compayré does not say that "there was not one who could read and write." Indeed, he affirms that there *was one*, that there was *only one* who could read and write. Here is the text: "En 1291, de tous les moines du couvent de Saint-Gall, il n'y avait qu'un qui sut lire et écrire." A variation of one monk more or less will not affect our argument. We wish merely to present the original text, which happens to allow one monk too many for the American translator.

"Nothing which can truly educate man, and develop his faculties as a whole, enlists the attention of the middle age." (84.)

"The methods employed in the ecclesiastical schools of the middle age were in accord with the spirit of the times, when men were not concerned with liberty and intellectual freedom; and when they thought more about teaching dogmas than about the training of the intelligence." (85.)

"The middle age in drawing to a close came nearer and nearer, in the way of continuous progress, to the decisive emancipation which the Renaissance and the Reformation were soon to perpetuate. . . . A higher education reserved to ecclesiastics and men of noble rank, an instruction which consisted in verbal legerdemain, which developed only the mechanism of reasoning, and made of the intelligence a prisoner of the formal syllogism; agreeably to the barbarism of primitive times, a fantastic pedantry which lost itself in superficial discussions and in verbal distinctions, popular education almost null and restricted to the teaching of the catechism in Latin; finally, a Church, absolute and sovereign, which determined for all, great and small, the limits of thought, of belief, and of action; such was, from our point of view, the condition of the middle age." (90.)

Entering upon the subject of the Renaissance our author says: "The education of the middle age . . . is to be succeeded, at least in theory, by an education broader and more liberal . . . which will enfranchise the intelligence, hitherto the prisoner of the syllogism." (92.)

"The pedagogy of Rabelais is the first appearance of what may be called *realism* in instruction, in distinction from the scholastic *formalism*. The author of *Gargantua* turns the mind of the young man towards objects truly worthy of occupying his attention." (101.)

"Notwithstanding some grave defects, the pedagogy of Montaigne is a pedagogy of good sense, and certain parts of it will always deserve to be admired. The Jansenists, and Locke, and Rousseau, in different degrees, draw their inspiration from Montaigne." (120.)

A few sentences will show how he feels towards Protestantism, Jansenism and rationalism:

"It is to the Protestant Reformers—to Luther in the sixteenth century, and to Comenius in the seventeenth—that must be ascribed the honor of having first organized schools for the people. In its origin, the primary school is the child of Protestantism, and its cradle was the Reformation. . . . The Reform, then, contained, in germ, a complete revolution in education; it enlisted the interests of religion in the service of instruction, and associated knowledge with faith." (123.)

"Among the religious orders (*sic*) that have consecrated their efforts to the work of teaching, the first place must be assigned to the Jesuits and the Jansenists. . . . For the Jesuits, education is reduced to a superficial culture of the brilliant faculties of the intelligence; while the Jansenists, on the contrary, aspire to develop the solid faculties, the judgment and the reason. . . . The merit of institutions ought not always to be measured by their apparent success. . . . Although the Jesuits have not ceased to rule in appearance, it is the Jansenists who triumph in reality, and who to-day control the secondary instruction of France." (149.)

Opening the subject of the eighteenth century, he says: "The most striking of the general characteristics of French pedagogy in the eighteenth century, is that in it the lay spirit comes into mortal collision with the ecclesiastical spirit. What a contrast between the clerical preceptors of the seventeenth century and the philosophical educators of the eighteenth! . . . The philosophical spirit, which associates the theory of education with the laws of the human spirit . . . will come to light in the *Emile*, and in some other writings of the same period. . . . Finally, and this last characteristic is but the consequence of the others, education tends to become national, and at the same time humane. Preparation for life replaces preparation for death. During the whole of the eighteenth century a conception is in process of elaboration which the men of the Revolution will exhibit in its true light—that of an education public and national, which makes citizens, which works for country and for real life." (302.)

For an appreciation of the author's advocacy of a completely socialistic (with him "lay and national") system of education, we must refer the reader to the whole volume.

All things considered, the extensive use of the book in schools of pedagogy is not a very flattering index of the status of scholarship in America. This wide use of the book we are not going to attribute to malice, to a deliberate design of spreading error, concealing truth and inculcating false principles. To do this would be to take to ourselves the prerogative of searching consciences. This aside, then, there is left to us only the other alternative of ascribing the repute in which the book is held to a lack of knowledge in the now very much affected study, the history of education. There are three things that go to make up scholarship: a broad and strong grasp of unassailable principles, an exhaustive erudition, an expedite power of applying principles to the sum total of material. This promptness of application demands long exercise in the ready handling of the principles, a panoramic view of the entire matter together with a memory of details, quickness in the discovery both of opposition

and relationship, power of classification which has grown to be as an instinct, a second nature. President Schurman, of Cornell University, referring in his report for 1900-1901 to the support of professors, says (page 3): "There is some danger of scholarship and science being starved out in America; there is serious danger of their falling into neglect, if not contempt." We present his testimony in support of our own observation, though we are not disposed to admit the ultimate cause assigned, namely, a lack of endowment. Endowment is now a favorite object of educational pursuit; and the result of the quest is even a super-abundance. But it is put into brick and mortar, instead of going into the head and stomach and on the back of the professor. Schools and libraries are going up at the cost of millions; but the libraries are few and far between where a professor can enter to prepare an unbiased and erudite lecture. Whereas the little that would be required to provide proper equipment for the professor would bring to his university more glory than can be purchased by the millions that are poured out on the architectural ornaments of an education. The epoch of building is not commonly an epoch of scholarship. The value of a school is really in the ability of its professors and in the opportunities afforded them to give full scope to their genius. It is the professor that makes the school. True scholarship and teaching ability on the part of the professor ought to be the drawing card which a school should aim at possessing. Yet, when do we now hear of students going to a particular school for the benefit to be derived from the lectures and experience of an individual professor? They are attracted by the size of the establishment, by the number of students, by the mere course as printed in a catalogue or year-book, by the Rugby, base-ball and general athletics which occupy a page in every morning's paper. And we all know very well that the essential thing, the professor, may often be found of better quality in the lower estate. And if we go further down the line to observe how things stand in the matter of primary instruction, we shall see that capability is an object of no greater reverence; we shall discover, not infrequently, in suburban obscurity, the genius that would have done honor to the neighboring metropolis.

We have been led to this digression by the wide favor accorded to the book of M. Compayré. This favor is clearest proof of a decline in scholarship, and of an imminent danger pointed out by President Schurman. When a book on education, so utterly untrustworthy, is hailed as a boon by professional educators, they pass sentence on themselves, and we need not seek further for witness.

W. POLAND, S. J.

St. Louis, Mo.

ANARCHISM.

EVER since the beginning of the last quarter of the century just past the nations of continental Europe have been persistently haunted by the grim spectre of Anarchy. During this period its appearances have been growing in frequency, and have been embracing a wider and wider area, whilst its manifestations have been growing more violent and more appalling. We have not been unfamiliar with Anarchism in the United States. But with us, if we except the Chicago outbreak of 1886, the phenomenon has been a passive one, and our interest in it has been largely of the sort termed academic. Aside from the Chicago manifestation and the period of excitement that followed it, the development of Anarchism here, or the discussion and dissemination of its principles, has not caused us much concern; nor has it impressed us as a serious menace to persons or things in these United States, or as presenting any dangers sufficiently actual or tangible to warrant our grappling with it as a practical problem.

It all seemed something rather remote from us. When from time to time an Anarchist, with pistol or dagger, has struck down some foreign ruler, or other high political personage, or with a bursting bomb has converted some dignified political assemblage or some quiet pleasure seeking gathering into a panic-stricken mob, and sent terror abroad throughout the state, we have been shocked in no small degree, and we have felt a natural and a sincere sympathy with the state or the community that has sustained the shock. But in the natural order our own sense of shock, and even our sympathy, have been tempered by distance; and we did not, and could not, appreciate the full shock or the full significance of Anarchist outrage, until, occurring at our own doors, it appalled and stunned our senses by its suddenness, its nearness, its wanton hideousness. Then Anarchism and Anarchists became a theme of all absorbing interest to us.

In the pulpit and the press, in club and in drawing room, in office, factory and shop, in the corner grocery and on the street curb, Anarchy was the theme, and every one was ready with a dogmatic theory as to its one and only source, and with clearly formulated remedy for its extirpation. Not that all this assurance came from any deeper study, or clearer knowledge of the subject than we had had before; it was merely that the calmness with which we had regarded Anarchy, and discussed it, when it seemed merely Europe's concern, had, nearly everywhere, given way precipitately to excited

thought and intemperate speech. "Stamping out" was the catch-word of the hour, and the retrospect of that feverish outburst is not entirely flattering. Even conservative papers opened their columns freely to letters proposing punishment of varying degrees of ferocity. This was nothing short of a recrudescence of savagery. Ministers of the sublime gospel of peace and forgiveness, standing in their high places and speaking as accredited leaders of thought, clamored for the fullest revenge, after the fashion of the most unregenerate humanity; and some of them—if reported correctly in the daily press—went so far as to regret that they had not been by to slay the assassin with their own hand—to revenge assassination by assassination. These men were of the stuff that mobs are made of; and it was aptly said of them that they were "invoking anarchy in one of its manifestations to stamp out anarchy in another of its manifestations." Then, too, we had a clamor for drastic legislation that should punish by banishment or imprisonment any one who "thought anarchy," or held any views subversive of the existing social order, and a huge secret service was to be established to spy out men's secret thoughts. Of course all this would have been thoroughly impracticable, even if it had been politic; and if it had been practical its consequence would have been to turn back the whole march of progress, and abandon in a moment of panic the choicest privileges, rights, and safeguards of freedom that the race had suffered and struggled through centuries to attain. But this frame of mind did not endure; it was merely a passing hysteric.

The days following the brutal assassination of President McKinley were days that tried severely men's powers of self-restraint and of measured thought and speech; and so few there were who withstood the test, that most of us would agree with the sober minded reviewer who wrote: "One fact that recent events must have impressed upon the country is the comparatively small proportion of those figuring prominently as moulders of public opinion whose counsels can be followed safely at critical periods."

Our calmer judgment is now resuming its sway, and the later articles that are appearing on the subject are dealing with the problem of Anarchism from a saner point of view. But the reaction seems to be inclining us too much the other way, and there is a tendency to minimize the character of the problem that Anarchism presents, and to mistake the nature of Anarchism itself. We are too much inclined to investigate the subject at long range, and, in consequence, we are not getting that intimate knowledge of it that we should possess before we try to determine its causes or formulate antidotes.

At the outset we must distinguish between the philosophy or the

theory of Anarchism, and the propaganda; and we must clearly understand the sense in which we are to take the term anarchy or anarchism.

Anarchy, etymologically, means simply "without government," and it is in this colorless sense that we must understand it in our discussion. The lesson of history almost everywhere has been that "no government" has meant disorder, riot, chaos, so that the term anarchy has come historically to signify political and social chaos. But we must dissociate this meaning from our word, if we are to make any progress in the attempt to understand the nature and the development of the "Anarchism" proposed by Proudhon and the later anarchists as a programme for social reform. In the light of all our experience, and with human nature as we know it, and as it has always been since that misty prehistoric "golden age" of the poets, it may of course be argued that chaos is what the adoption of any form of Anarchism would surely bring us to again; but this is not what the anarchist advocates, nor what he professedly anticipates, and in studying his theory we must take it first as he understands it. Let us, then, first, give the theory its mildest exposition; and, then, take it in its active expression.

The Century Dictionary gives as one definition of Anarchy, "A social theory which regards the union of order with the absence of all direct government of man by man as the political ideal; absolute individual liberty." This is a statement of the essence of the theory, and is accepted as a correct statement of it by Anarchists themselves—one Anarchist organ flying it at the masthead. Beyond these two ideas, of order and absence of government, there is nothing that can be added as an essential element of the root theory of Anarchism. Various economic systems have been advocated at different times by Anarchists. The Anarchism of Proudhon, for example, was a "collectivism," similar in many respects to the programme of Socialism at the present time. It differed from "State Socialism" chiefly in this, that it was not to be founded on compulsion, but was to be a voluntary organization entered into freely by all, and any organization or any form of organization was to be terminable at will. When asked what was to be the power that should secure order in such a society, Proudhon always answered, "Justice."

On the other hand, the economic system advocated by Kropotkin and his school—which is perhaps the representative school of present day Anarchism—is not a "collectivist" but a communistic régime. And the force that Kropotkin relies upon to preserve order in his free society is a "sense of solidarity," which he maintains is inherent in men.

We are not concerned here to discuss the practicability of either of these forms of economic and social organization, nor the weakness of the compelling forces upon which they depend to preserve order. Proudhon himself is quoted as having in his later life become "convinced and expressed his conviction in his work upon the federative principle (*Du Principe Fédératif*) that ordered Anarchy was an ideal, and as such could never be realized, but that nevertheless human society should strive to attain it by means of federative organizations, as he had sketched it in his earlier writings." (Zenker, p. 89.)

The theory of anarchy as sketched by Proudhon, and his hope of approximating towards it by education and perfection of the individual, did not impress even those of his contemporaries who were firm adherents of the established order as anything very terrible.

In 1850 a review of Proudhon's "*Les Confessions d'un Revolutionnaire*," in the *Eclectic Magazine*, an English evangelical journal, thus passes judgment on Proudhon's plan of anarchism:

"If ever there was a system which deserved the name of Utopian, it is surely this. Obviously, however, there is nothing offensive or terrible in socialism of such a stamp. It aims at realizing for all what the choicest spirits do even now realize for themselves—that is, perfect independence of thought and action. The moral, well educated man never feels the existence of authority but as a grievous or necessary evil. Suppose all moral and well educated—what then? Government is only rendered necessary by vice and ignorance; and, these two enemies extirpated, becomes a useless burden. . . . But we confess that, as yet, we see nothing ahead that warrants us in supposing that man is about to be regenerated; and, for the present, must pronounce anarchy to be a delightful dream."

Nothing occurred to change this tolerant view of Anarchy until the renaissance of its propaganda under new and more aggressive leaders, who were men of action more than of theory, revolutionists who gave to the new agitation the sanction of the dagger and the bomb.

Then the theory and the propaganda were not distinguished, and both alike came in for indiscriminate attack. After every outrage committed in its name, Anarchism comes in for a torrent of abuse. When the excitement of the hour has passed, the reaction sets in, as at present with us, and a distinction is made between what is termed "philosophic anarchy," and anarchist outrage; and whilst the latter comes in for all the excoriation it merits, the former is handled much in the spirit of the earlier period, as indicated in the review of 1850, above quoted.

Thus, for example, a distinguished rector of a New York parish

of one of our most conservative denominations, was quoted, some time after the assassination of the President, as having said :

"Anarchism is in reality the ideal of political and social science, and also the ideal of religion. It is the ideal to which Jesus Christ looked forward. Christ founded no Church, established no State, gave practically no laws, organized no government and set up no external authority, but he did seek to write on the hearts of men God's law and make them self-legislating."

And the following, from a Western paper, is typical of the attitude towards Anarchism taken by most of the calmer minded who set themselves to oppose the violent outcry that was being raised against that theory :

"Anarchy is in itself no crime. If a man is a member of the Methodist Church and commits a murder, it doesn't follow that all Methodists must be hanged or exiled. There have, in fact, been many thousands of murders committed in the name of religion, while you can count on your fingers all that are charged to Anarchy in both hemispheres. The Anarchists are simply a society that holds that the world has arrived at that plane of intelligence wherein society would be better without formal laws than with it."

It is even said by many who wish to deal fairly with "philosophic Anarchy," that Anarchism is nothing more than the expression of man's longing for the ideal, the perfect moral state. The legends, it is pointed out, of all idealistic peoples have revelled in the picture of a prehistoric "golden age," when men lived with no other rule than that of each one's moral sense, when each one merely followed the law of his own unfallen, uncorrupted nature. Every age, in turn, has longed for the return of that lost paradise, and has fixed its hopes in the "millennium" that is yet to come, when the lion and the lamb shall lie down together, and all strife shall cease, and love, not force, shall rule. All this, it is argued, is merely the ideal of Anarchism ; in this sense it is said we may all be termed Anarchists ; and that what differentiates the man we call the "philosophic Anarchist" from the rest of us is merely his belief that the world is ready now, or that it could be made ready in the not distant future, for the Anarchic régime that we all desire, but the realization of which most of us defer to the remote and misty future of our "millennium."

Now all this may possibly be true of the ideal of an individual Anarchist here or there ; but we cannot accept the comparison as in any sense descriptive of the content or the philosophy of the *actual movement* for Anarchism that is going on about us to-day.

The present Anarchist movement rests upon a philosophy of Atheism, and upon the crudest and most materialistic interpretation of the hypothesis of evolution ; and it seems inextricably bound up with these. The comparison of Anarchism, as it exists here and now, with the ideal of the Christian "millennium," with the longed for kingdom of God upon earth, cloaks a most serious error, and masks a hideous incongruity. Between the two things there is a difference that is just as wide and just as deep as the gulf that lies between two

fundamentally antagonistic systems of philosophy. This, I believe, will be fully borne out by a brief survey of some of the basic principles that underlie modern Anarchism.

It is not, of course, possible to give any statement of Anarchism and say that it is the only correct statement of the theory; for there is not, and from the very nature of the thing there cannot be any authoritative declaration of principles or formulation of platform. The Anarchism of one man may be very different from that of another; and neither can claim for his theory anything more than his own authority. In the same way it may seem equally impossible to predicate any system of philosophy as the basis of Anarchism; and this point has been explicitly urged by one Anarchist leader, who writes:

"Myself at one time asserted very stoutly that no one could be an Anarchist and believe in God at the same time. Others assert as stoutly that one cannot accept the spiritualistic philosophy and be an Anarchist. At present I hold with C. L. James, the most learned of American Anarchists, that one's metaphysical system has very little to do with the matter. The chain of reasoning which once appeared so conclusive to me, namely, that Anarchism, being a denial of authority over the individual, could not coëxist with a belief in a Supreme Ruler of the universe, is contradicted in the case of Leo Tolstoy, who comes to the conclusion that none has a right to rule another just because of his belief in God, just because he believes that all are equal children of one father, and therefore none has a right to rule the other. I speak of him because he is a familiar and notable personage, but there have frequently been instances where the same idea has been worked out by a whole sect of believers, especially in the earlier (and persecuted) stages of their development. It no longer seems necessary to me, therefore, that one should base his Anarchism upon any particular world-conception; it is a theory of the relations of man to man, and comes as an offered solution to the societary problems arising from the existence of these two tendencies of which I have spoken."

But none the less there is, as a matter of fact, enough that is common in the beliefs and the teachings of the leaders of the present movement for Anarchism to give a distinctive character to that movement; and I have made a conscientious effort to get at the dominant phases of Anarchism as it is preached here in the United States at the present time. I have read much of the pamphlet and the periodical literature that has been furnished by professed Anarchists, and which represents their current thought; and I have been in correspondence with a number of Anarchists, in widely scattered parts of the country to find out from them exactly their views.¹

I believe that it is a fair statement of the real case to say that a crude interpretation of the hypothesis of evolution and a consequent corresponding denial of God are basic characteristics of current Anarchism. It may, of course, be urged, as is done in the extract above, that these are not necessary bases for a theory that is purely social. It may, indeed, be argued that much is mixed up with the actual movement to-day that is not essential to Anarch-

¹ And I beg to acknowledge here the uniform courtesy that I have received from them, and the willingness and the frankness with which they have answered all my inquiries, either about themselves or their teaching.

ism; and that we can conceive of the movement as dissociate from all this. But be this as it may, it cannot be too clearly realized that it is the actual movement—and that movement in its entirety, or in its dominating aspects—with which we are concerned as a practical problem; and not with a conceivable Anarchism that exists only in some discriminating imaginations.

In answer to the question, asked of a number of Anarchists, as to what writers had most influenced their thinking, the names of Bakounine and Kropotkin were in nearly every case given. Let us, then, take some of the principles of these two writers under review.

Bakounine rests his Anarchism on man's animal evolution. He takes as a "fundamental and decisive truth," that "the social world, properly speaking, the human world—in short, humanity—is nothing other than the supreme development, the highest manifestation of animality, at least on our planet as far as we know." (Bakounine: "God and the State," p. 3.)

Our first ancestors were "omnivorous, intelligent and ferocious beasts;" and their point of departure from their fellows in the process of evolution was that they had come to be "endowed in a higher degree than the animals of any other species with two precious faculties—the power to think and the desire to rebel." ("God and the State," p. 3.)

Bakounine, assuming the rôle of Biblical expositor, regards the story of the Fall, narrated in Genesis, as a myth, but with a kernel of truth hidden in it. This truth, he insists, is clear, but it has been inverted in the accepted interpretation, and it was reserved for him to give us the true explanation. There was no Fall, he explains, by the act of disobedience chronicled in Genesis; it was a rise. It was the beginning of the human stage in evolution. By this act "man has emancipated himself; he has separated himself from animality and constituted himself a man; he has begun his distinctively human history by an act of disobedience and science—that is, by rebellion and thought." ("God and the State," p. 4.)

With the instinct of a mad revolutionist, Bakounine aspostrophises the Satan of the story as "the eternal rebel, the first free thinker and the emancipator of worlds." For Bakounine, Satan is the real creator of man, for "he emancipates him—stamps upon his brow the seal of liberty and humanity, in urging him to disobey and eat of the fruit of knowledge." ("God and the State," p. 4.)

Only under an anarchic régime, then, can man realize the omega of his evolution, the goal of his rebellion; and the anarchic society of Bakounine must set up Satan as its patron saint, for it is the realization of his kingdom, rather than the "millennium" of Christ and his saints.

Starting from this basis, Bakounine reasons that Anarchism, the true freedom of man, is not compatible with the acceptance of a belief in God. Not only must man throw off all external authority to obtain his rightful freedom, not only must he reject the yoke of the state, or the authority of a visible church, but he cannot even acknowledge a God, or any moral order that would limit in any way the free play of his desires and his passions.

Treating "this question of the existence of a God, or of the divine origin of the world or of man, solely from the standpoint of its moral and social utility," he writes: "The idea of God implies the abdication of human reason and justice; it is the most decisive negation of human liberty, and necessarily ends in the enslavement of mankind, both in theory and practice." ("God and the State," p. 10.) He insists that the very ideas of God and of human liberty are logical contradictions, and that there can be no claim to liberty by a race holding to a belief in God. "For if God is, He is necessarily the eternal, supreme, absolute master, and if such a master exists, man is a slave; . . . His existence necessarily implies the slavery of all that is beneath Him. Therefore, if God existed, only in one way could He serve human liberty—that is, by ceasing to exist.

"A jealous lover of human liberty, and deeming it the absolute condition of all that we admire and respect in humanity, I reverse the phrase of Voltaire and say that if God existed, it would be necessary to abolish Him." ("God and the State," p. 12.) Is it from such seed as this that we are to reap on earth the kingdom of God and His justice?

There is no difficulty, then, in discovering the basis for Bakounine's demand for anarchic liberty; nor is it difficult to discern the nature and the extent of the liberty demanded for a deified, self-created humanity. Doubtless most of the "outsiders," who have been explaining "philosophic Anarchy" as merely the desire for the liberty that will come with moral development and self-restraint, would start back from the prospect of the "liberty" exercised in a social system based on the philosophy of Bakounine; and instead of confusing this type of Anarchism with the hope for the "millennium," we should rather proclaim that the liberty demanded is of a sort with which we have neither part nor sympathy.

In the writings of Kropotkin, who, after Bakounine, is one of the foremost of the godfathers and the prophets of modern Anarchism, we shall find more clearly worked out the moral principles that flow from the philosophy of Bakounine; and we shall understand just what is the nature of the moral force relied upon to secure the "order" that is to go hand in hand with absolute liberty in the day of Anarchism. Like Bakounine, he is an evolutionist who sees in

man only a higher development of animality, and he, consistently, goes to the animal kingdom to seek a basis for morality, and to find the standard for the distinction between what is good and what is evil.

For Kropotkin, the moral sense is merely "a feeling of solidarity," which he claims to find in beasts of every type as well as in man. "This feeling little by little became a habit, and was transmitted by heredity from the simplest microscopic organism to its descendants, insects, birds, reptiles, mammals, man." Finally, this feeling of solidarity, or in other words, the moral sentiment, becomes "a necessity to the animal, like food or the organ for digesting it." We need not fear that man will lose the moral sentiment, for "even if we wished to get rid of it, we could not. It would be easier for a man to accustom himself to walk on all fours than to get rid of the moral sentiment. It is anterior, in animal evolution, to the upright posture of man. The moral sense is a natural faculty in us, like the sense of smell or touch." (Kropotkin: "Anarchist Morality," p. 13.)

This "feeling of solidarity" leads all animals, man included, to recognize as good any action or line of conduct that tends to "the preservation of the race;" and as bad, all that operates against this preservation. The Anarchist standard of moral action, according to Kropotkin, is thus simply summed up: "Is this useful to society? Then it is good. Is this hurtful? Then it is bad." ("Anarchist Morality," p. 9.)

So much for the speculative basis of his philosophy. And we may, perhaps, argue that so far organized society need have no quarrel with this philosophy or this standard of morality, since they seem to make for the preservation of society itself. But when we come to the practical application that Kropotkin makes of the conclusions that naturally flow from his premises, we reach the point at which society will most certainly take issue with Anarchism. The brain, says Kropotkin, "released from religious terrors," asks itself, "why should any morality be obligatory?" Having founded his moral sense on an evolved animal instinct, having made it a natural faculty, "like the sense of smell or touch," he sees that we have no more right to force our own peculiar development of this instinct upon our neighbor than we have to try to force upon him our peculiar individual standard of touch or smell, and he, therefore, denies "both obligation and moral sanction." "We forego, with Gayau, even sanctions of all kinds, even obligations to morality. We are not afraid to say: 'Do what you will; act as you will;' because we are persuaded that the great majority of mankind, in proportion to their degree of enlightenment, and the completeness with which they free themselves from existing fetters, will behave and act always in

a direction useful to society; just as we are persuaded beforehand that a child will one day walk on its two feet, and not on all fours, simply because it is born of parents belonging to the genus homo."

This is, truly, the superlative of optimism—it sounds, indeed, like the very ecstasy of madness. But if such naïve optimism be as unwarranted as experience leads the judicious to suspect it is, our philosopher leaves us helpless. For he stoutly maintains that in dealing with the refractory "all we can do is to give advice;" and lest even this might seem an impertinent attempt to limit that absolute freedom of the individual so precious to the Anarchist, we must always modestly add: 'This advice will be valueless if your own experience and observation do not lead you to recognize that it is worth following.' . . . We have only the right to give advice, to which we add: Follow it, if it seems good to you." ("Anarchist Morality," p. 16.)

So insistent is he that we must leave "to each one the right to act as he thinks best," that our philosopher denies utterly "the right of society to punish any one, in any way, for any anti-social act he may have committed." ("Anarchist Morality," p. 16.) Here is no modest demand for "freedom of thought," but an unmistakable shriek for freedom of action. How much this means, what its logical consequences are, we shall understand better when we come to discuss the Anarchist theory of "propaganda by deed." But even in its abstract form we recognize it as a mild invitation to social suicide, and, with the recollection of such acts as Czolgosz's still fresh in our minds, society will most emphatically decline to leave to each one the right to act as he thinks best—with impunity.

The attitude of Anarchism towards marriage and the family is here shadowed forth. It naturally follows from Kropotkin's premises that marriage, as an institution, should cease. I have not come upon anything of Kropotkin's dealing specifically with the institution of marriage; but the consequence of his teaching is too plain to be mistaken. Some of his colleagues deal with the matter more directly, and state in exact terms the attitude of Anarchism towards marriage. Says Grave: "The Anarchists, therefore, reject the institution of marriage. . . . What they (the parties to a marriage) have made of their own free will they can unmake of their own free will. . . . Is it necessary that these two beings, because in a moment of passionate effervescence they deceived themselves with illusions, should pay a whole lifetime of suffering for the error of a moment, which made them take for a profound and eternal passion what was but the result of an over-excitation of the senses?" (Grave: "Moribund Society and Anarchy," p. 39.)

It cannot be said that this is anything more than the logical conclusion from the premises of Bakounine and Kropotkin. It explicitly reduces marriage to a mere episode of "cohabitation-at-will," and ushers in the reign of "free love." A recognized Anarchist leader, writing in one of their journals of last May, regrets exceedingly that any one "should insult those who believe in free love by treating it as a heinous offense;" and he asks, "In the name of Liberalism, why should a man be discredited for believing in free love, any more than in free silver?"

I think it will be admitted that the nature and the extent of the "liberty" demanded for the individual by Bakounine, Kropotkin and their colleagues, is something very different from the ideal of liberty desired by the Christian and God-fearing men who have been mistakenly abetting the cause of Anarchism by identifying the two things. It cannot be repeated too emphatically, that the confusing of these two ideals is vicious. For, taking the words of the leaders of Anarchism themselves, their demand for liberty rests on a basis that necessitates the annihilation of all belief in a creating God, all belief in a redeeming Christ, all belief in the institution of marriage, and, in short, all belief in any obligatory morality or in any moral standard or moral sanction.

Let us now pass from "philosophic Anarchy" to "practical Anarchy," from the philosophy of Anarchism to the agitation for the spread of this philosophy and the inauguration of the actual revolution that is to usher in the new régime.

This propagandism has two representatives, "the man with a book, and the man with a bomb." Their respective activities may be described as a "campaign of education"—to borrow a phrase from "practical politics"—and a campaign of assassination.

So far as the first sort of campaign is concerned, it does not materially differ from any other peaceful propaganda carried on for the dissemination of a theory; but the extent of the activity in it is, perhaps, little understood.

The second method of propagandism, the campaign of assassination, is more novel; and its real nature and significance are, probably, not at all understood by "outsiders." The list of crimes, which, during the past quarter of a century, have been perpetrated in the name of Anarchism, have not by any means been merely those mad and aimless acts of irresponsible individuals, such as mark every acute social agitation. They have not been aimless. On the contrary, they have a philosophy behind them. They represent one phase of a systematic propagandism, styled by the Anarchists themselves, "propaganda by deed," or "propaganda by action"—which has been one of the distinguishing features of the later Anarchist

movement. It represents a policy borrowed from the Nihilist of Russia, and it was incorporated in the Anarchist movement when Anarchism, which, after a short celebrity, was passing into oblivion, was revived in Western Europe by Russian refugees. For it must be understood that it is the baleful and blasphemous influence of Michael Bakounine, and of his Russian disciples, and not the spirit of Proudhon, or his German contemporaries, that has given character to the modern Anarchist movement, and lent to it the sanction of the dagger and the bomb.

The conditions in Russia were such that many of the Nihilist leaders felt that the great body of the Russian people was ripe for revolt; and that it only needed a few acts of daring on the part of individuals to awaken the masses to the fact that the revolution had begun and to inspire them with a sense of their own power. What was needed, they felt, was not so much to convert the people to the principles of revolution—thanks to the despotism, that was already done; it was only necessary to arouse the masses to action, by acts of personal revolt. "Words," writes one of the Nihilist leaders, "have no value for us, unless followed at once by action. But all is not action that is so called; for example, the modest and too cautious organization of secret societies without external announcements to outsiders is in our eyes merely ridiculous and intolerable child's-play. By external announcements we mean a series of actions that positively destroy something—a person, a cause, a condition that hinders the emancipation of the people. Without sparing our lives, we must break into the life of the people with a series of rash, even senseless, actions, and inspire them with a belief in their powers, awake them, unite them, and lead them on to the triumph of their cause." (Netschajew: quoted by Zenker, "Anarchism," p. 168.)

Brousse, another disciple of Bakounine, and one of the leading spirits of the Bakounist revival of Anarchism, seized the idea of this "propaganda by action," and advocated it for the spread of Anarchism in the Western world. "Deeds," says he, "are talked of on all sides; the indifferent masses inquire about their origin, and thus pay attention to the new doctrine, and discuss it. Let men once get as far as this, and it is not hard to win over many of them." (Zenker, p. 169.)

It is to be noted, therefore, that assassination and outrage are counseled, not because they directly realize the aim of Anarchy; not that it is thought that the removal of a Czar or a King or a President will at once overturn the system of which he is the head; but they are counseled as a sort of "sanguinary advertisement" to attract the mass of the people to the study of Anarchism. The man with the bomb thus acts as advance agent for the man with the book.

In the light of this sort of philosophy, acts of outrage that had seemed wanton and aimless take on another complexion.

Since the assassination of President McKinley it has been asserted on all sides, both by Anarchists themselves and by many who, while having no sympathy with their doctrines, have desired to deal with them in all fairness, that violence and murder are no essential part of the philosophy of Anarchism; and that these outrages, when perpetrated by individual Anarchists, should not be laid to the charge of Anarchism itself. Thus, Emma Goldman writes:

"Having shown that violence is not the result of personal influence or one particular ideal, I deem it unnecessary to go into a lengthy theoretical discussion as to whether Anarchism contains the element of force or not. The question has been discussed time and again, and it is proven that Anarchism and violence are as far apart from each other as liberty and tyranny. I care not what the rabble says, but to those who are still capable of understanding I would say that anarchism, being a philosophy of life, aims to establish a state of society in which man's inner make-up and the conditions around him can blend harmoniously together, so that he will be able to utilize all the forces to enlarge and beautify the life about him. To those I would also say that I do not advocate violence; government does this, and force begets force."—*Free Society*, October 6.

Another writer, not an Anarchist, takes up the cudgels for Anarchism, believing that it is being misrepresented, and hails it as a gospel of peace, and not "a message of blood:"

"Anarchy aims to abolish government not by killing rulers, but developing thoughts in the minds of men, that government is not necessary, that there is room enough on earth for men to dwell in peace and plenty, without standing armies, police, jails and scaffolds. The Anarchist propaganda is not a message of blood, but of peace; it appeals to reason, to human sympathy. Study their literature and it will be found that there is no connection between Czolgosz's act and the philosophy of Anarchy. Suppose Czolgosz was an Anarchist. It is cruel and inhuman to hold all Anarchists responsible for the act of one of their number. The slayer of Garfield claimed that he had a mission from God to kill the President, but did the world at large hold Christianity responsible for that bloody act?"—George B. Wheeler in the *Freethought Ideal*, quoted in *Free Society*, October 27.

From London comes the assurance that Anarchism has dispensed with bombs, and that when murder is wrought it is at the wicked instigation of the enemies of Anarchism—the police. "Anarchists do not make plots in these days; they know that in every case where bomb throwing is advocated the suggestion comes from a police pupil or a police dupe." (*Freedom*, London. Quoted in *Free Society*, October 20.)

Another Anarchist leader assures us that the Anarchists themselves deprecated the act of Czolgosz, as likely to injure their cause with the public:

"On September 7 last there was probably not an Anarchist in the United States who did not deprecate the act of Czolgosz, if as nothing else, then as probably a great blow to Anarchism."—*Free Society*, October 27.

And another Anarchist writer seeks to render "propaganda by deed" a mere statement of an old platitude:

"'Propaganda by deed' is now often quoted as an interpretation of assassination.

In reality its advocates meant to convey nothing else than the carrying out of our beliefs into action. All theories are of little value unless they are applied to our daily life and conduct."—*Free Society*, October 27.

These extracts assert: first, that there is no necessary connection between the philosophy of Anarchism and violence or assassination; and, second, that Anarchists do not, as a matter of expediency, counsel violence, and that "propaganda by deed" has no such sinister signification as is claimed by those who identify it with assassination. As to the first position, it is entirely beside the particular point that is of concern to us. The speculative philosophy of Anarchism may or may not be entirely separable in theory from violence, or murder; our concern is not with the philosophy of Anarchism, but with the present Anarchist movement. It may, in turn, be urged that violence and murder are, carefully speaking, not an essential part of the Anarchist movement. But this, too, is beside the point; the question of real interest to us is, does it actually form a part of that movement? We have little concern with a possible, or an imaginary, or an "expurgated" Anarchist movement; but we have much concern with the actual movement that is going on about us—and with that movement in its entirety. As to the contention that the Anarchists do not advocate violence, and that "propaganda by deed" does not mean assassination—all this is simply not true. It will be seen from what follows that the Anarchist movement has, as a matter of fact, incorporated within itself both the philosophy and the practice of the assassination feature of this diabolical "propaganda by deed." In proof of this, let us place in contrast to the disclaimers already quoted the following unequivocal statements, taken from writings at the present time current in Anarchist circles, and written by leaders whose influence is, admittedly, strongly felt in the movement now going on in the United States.

Let us first understand, from an accepted Anarchist source, just what is the interpretation of the phrase "propaganda by deed." We shall find it clearly interpreted in "Moribund Society and Anarchy," a work written in French by Jean Grave, and much esteemed by Anarchists. It was translated into English about two years ago, and has had much circulation in American Anarchist circles. Grave does not mince matters; he is sufficiently explicit for the most exacting. On pages 125-6 we find:

"'Propaganda by deed' is nothing more than thought transferred into action; and in the preceding chapter we observed that to feel a thing profoundly is to want to realize it. This is a sufficient reply to detractors. But, *per contra*, there are some Anarchists more incensed than enlightened who have, in turn, been more anxious to relegate everything to propaganda by deed; to kill the capitalists, to knock employers on the head, set fire to the factories and monu-

ments, that was all they could think of; whoever failed to talk about burning and killing was unworthy to call himself an Anarchist!

"Now, as to action our position is this: We have already said that action is the flowering of thought; but furthermore this action must have an aim, we must know what it is about, it must tend towards an end sought and not turn against itself. Let us take for example, the incendiary burning of a factory in full operation; it employs a large number of workmen. The director of this factory is an average employer, neither too good nor too bad, of whom nothing in particular is to be said. Evidently if this factory is set afire, without either rhyme or reason, it can have no other effect but to throw the workmen into the streets. These latter, furious at the temporary access of misery to which they are thereby reduced, will not hunt for the reasons which prompted the authors of the deed; they will most certainly devote all their anger to the incendiaries and the ideas which led them to take up the torch. Behold the consequences of an unreasonable act! But let us, on the other hand, suppose a struggle between employers and workmen—any sort of strife. In a strike there surely are some employers more cruel than others, who by their exactions have necessitated this strike or by their intrigues have kept it up longer by persuading their colleagues to resist the demands of the strikers; without doubt these employers draw upon themselves the hatred of the workers. Let us suppose one of the like executed in some corner, with a placard posted explaining that he has been killed as an exploiter, or that his factory has been burned from the same motive. In such a case there is no being mistaken as to the reasons prompting the authors of the deeds, and we may be sure that they will be applauded by the whole laboring world. Such are intelligent deeds, which show that actions should always follow a guiding principle."

With equal explicitness, Grave tells his Anarchist brethren of other lines of "action" besides assassination:

"At the outset Anarchists must renounce the warfare of army against army, battles arrayed on fields, struggles laid out by strategists and tacticians manœuvring armed bodies as the chess player manœuvres his figures upon the chess-board. The struggle should be directed chiefly towards the destruction of institutions. The burning up of deeds, registers of land surveys, proceedings of notaries and solicitors, tax collectors' books, the ignoring of the limits of holdings, destruction of the regulations of the civil staff, etc.; the expropriation of the capitalists, taking possession in the name of all, putting articles of consumption freely at the disposal of all—all this is the work of small and scattered groups, of skirmishes, not regular battles. And this is the warfare which the Anarchists must seek to

encourage everywhere in order to harass governments, compel them to scatter their forces; tire them out and decimate them piecemeal. No need of leaders for blows like these; as soon as some one realizes what should be done he preaches by example, acting so as to attract others to him." (P. 123.)

But we need not go so far from home, nor a year or more back, to find the principles of warfare that are recommended by those on the "inside" as proper to the Anarchist movement. A California exponent of principles—a woman—writing in a recognized organ of the Anarchists, under date of the past April, explicitly urges on her comrades a carnival of "looting," in which bank, church, government treasuries, shop, and private household, shall alike be the object of indiscriminate attack. For her text she takes, "The strong, from the beginning, have stolen their bread;" and then proceeds: "But, I would ask, why do those of us who recognize the thieves, hesitate, from 'principle,' to appropriate, 'without money and without price,' anything they 'own' which we want whenever it is handy for us to do so? . . . Courage is required to run the risk of detection and detention by the 'authorities,' but is the need for fearlessness greater than that demanded for the expression of revolutionary ideas, or to defy Grundy in everyday life? . . . Many conventional people excuse theft from vampires if the deed be done to ward off starvation. Is mere capacity for breathing life? To the lover of beauty it is hardship if prevented from having beautiful things. The hindering is, without question, the starving of the part of the individual. If 'self preservation is the first law of nature,' who shall blame a poverty pinched person from pilfering a privileged parasite?"

"Do I advocate theft as part of an economic system of society? By no means. In a FREE society theft would be impossible. In an authoritarian society it cannot be avoided. What I advocate is disobedience to authority, and I maintain that thwarting its schemes in any measure or by any means is estimable—it is revolutionary. . . .

"When a rebel refuses to pay rent or tax, or beats a railroad corporation out of the customary fare, the acts are commended by every genuine revolutionist. In my opinion the deed is not less deserving of praise if it be the looting of a bank, or church money-box, or government treasury, or if shoplifting, common burglary, or petty larceny, be practised. . . .

"Theft from the rich spongers is honorable, not only when committed to slay the wolf of hunger, but also when an artistic taste can be gratified or cultivated, a mechanical faculty developed, work and worry lessened, pleasure gained—in short, whenever the comfort of the oppressed can be enhanced thereby."

And this is the stuff that is preached in the name of the Anarchist movement!

Kropotkin probably stands foremost amongst the living prophets of modern Anarchism, and he is usually regarded as a "philosophic Anarchist," as one who would give no countenance to a campaign of violence, and who rejects the "propaganda of action." But I find him quoted very directly to the contrary. The following is given as h's reply to the question of "how words must be translated into deeds:"

"The answer is easy; it is action, the continual, incessantly renewed action of the minority that will produce this transformation. Courage, devotion, self-sacrifice, are as contagious as cowardice, subjection, and terror. What form is action to take? Any form—as different as are circumstances, means, and temperaments. Sometimes arousing sorrow, sometimes scorn, but always bold; sometimes isolated, sometimes in common, it despises no means ready to hand, it neglects no opportunity of public life to propagate discontent, and to clothe it in words, to arouse hatred against the exploiter, to make the ruling powers ridiculous, to show their weakness, and ever to excite audacity, the spirit of revolt, by the preaching of example. If a feeling of revolution awakes in a country, and the spirit of open revolt is already sufficiently alive among the masses to break out in tumultuous disorders in the streets, *émeutes* and risings—then it is 'action' alone by which the minority can create this feeling of independence and that atmosphere of audacity without which no revolution can be completed. Men of courage who do not stop at words, but seek to transform them into deeds, pure characters for whom the action and the idea are inseparable, who prefer prisons, exile, or death, rather than a life not in accordance with their principles, fearless men, who know what must be risked in order to win success—those are the devoted outposts who begin the battle long before the masses are sufficiently moved to unfurl the standard of insurrection, and to march sword in hand to the conquest of their rights. Amid complaints, speeches, theoretical discussions, an act of personal or general revolt takes place. It cannot be otherwise than that the great mass at first remains indifferent; those especially who admire the courage of the person or group that took the initiative will apparently follow the wise and prudent in hastening to describe this act as folly, and in speaking of the fools and hot-headed people who compromise everything. These wise and prudent ones had fully calculated that their party, if it slowly pursued its objects, would perhaps have conquered the world in one, two, or three centuries, and now the unforeseen intrudes! The unforeseen is that which was not foreseen by the prudent. But those who know his-

tory and can lay claim to any well ordered reasoning power, however small, know quite well that a theoretical propaganda of revolution must necessarily be translated into action long before theorists have decided that the time for it has come. None the less, the theorists are enraged with the 'fools' and excommunicate and ban them. But the fools find sympathy, the mass of the people secretly applaud their boldness, and they find imitators. In proportion as the first of them fill the prisons, others come forward to continue their work. The acts of illegal protest, of revolt, of revenge increase. Indifference becomes impossible. Those who at first only asked what on earth the fools meant, are compelled to take them seriously, to discuss their ideas, and to take sides for or against. By acts which are done under the notice of the people the new idea communicates itself to men's minds and finds adherents. One such act makes in a few days more proselytes than thousands of books."²

In his work, "Anarchist Morality" (pp. 14-15), Kropotkin unequivocally, and quite coolly, concedes the right of theft and assassination to those who, in his jargon, "have conquered the right." Here are his words:

"Perhaps it may be said—it has been said sometimes—'But if you think you must always treat others as you would be treated yourself, what right have you to use force under any circumstances whatsoever? What right have you to level a cannon at any barbarous or civilized invaders of your country? What right have you to dispossess the exploiter? What right to kill not only a tyrant, but a mere viper?'

"What right? What do you mean by that singular word, borrowed from the law? Do you wish to know if I shall feel conscious of having acted well in doing this? If those I esteem will think I have done well? Is that what you ask? If so, the answer is simple.

"Yes, certainly! Because we, we ourselves, should ask to be killed, like venomous beasts, if we went to invade Burmese or Zulus, who have done us no harm. We should say to our son or our friend: 'Kill me, if I ever take part in the invasion!'

"Yes, certainly! Because we, we ourselves, should ask to be dispossessed if, giving the lie to our principles, we seized upon an inheritance, did it fall from on high, to use it for the exploitation of others.

"Yes, certainly! Because any man with a heart asks beforehand that he may be slain, if ever he becomes venomous; that a dagger may be plunged into his heart, if ever he should take the place of a dethroned tyrant. . . .

² I have taken this quotation at second hand. I have not been able to get the original containing it, but it is given in a reliable treatise, and the reference is to Kropotkin's work by title and page, "*L'Esprit de Revolte*," p. 7.

"Perovskaya and her comrades killed the Russian Czar. And all mankind, despite the repugnance to the spilling of blood, despite the sympathy for one who had allowed the serfs to be liberated, recognized their right to do as they did. Why? Not because the act was generally recognized as useful; two out of three still doubt if it was so; but because it was felt that not for all the gold in the world would Perovskaya and her comrades have consented to become tyrants themselves. Even those who know nothing of the drama are certain that it was no youthful bravado, no palace conspiracy, no attempt to gain power; it was hatred of tyranny, even to the scorn of self, even to the death.

" 'These men and women,' it was said, 'had conquered the right to kill;' as it was said of Louise Michel, 'she had the right to rob;' or again, 'they have the right to steal,' in speaking of those terrorists who lived on dry bread, and stole a million or two of the Kishineff treasure, taking, at their own peril, all possible precaution to free the sentinel, who guarded the wealth with fixed bayonet, from all responsibility.

"Mankind has never refused the right to use force to those who have conquered that right, be it exercised upon the barricades or in the shadow of a cross-way. But if such an act is to produce a deep impression upon men's minds, the right must be conquered. Without this, such an act, whether useful or no, will remain merely a brutal fact, of no importance in the progress of ideas. Folks will see in it nothing but a displacement of force, simply the substitution of one exploiter for another."

In view of utterances like these, all general disclaimers, all assertions that Anarchism, as it actually exists here and now, is purely a gospel of peace, a serene and beautiful philosophic ideal, that involves no theory of violence and neither encourages nor justifies pillage or assassination, simply become empty rhetoric. Not only do Anarchists encourage the ill balanced to acts of murder, but they applaud the actual commission, and accept the perpetrator as one of their heroes. In an Anarchist lecture delivered in Philadelphia last April, and republished in Chicago within a month after the assassination of the President, we find the following "as to methods" of propagandism:

"A few words as to the methods. In times past Anarchists have excluded each other on these grounds also; revolutionists contemptuously said 'Quaker' of peace men; 'savage Communists' anathematized the Quakers in return. This, too, is passing. I say this: all methods are to the individual capacity and decision."

The lecturer then goes on to describe the favorite methods of propagandism adopted by "John Most," "Peter Kropotkin," and other lights, and approves each for adopting the method best suited

to his temperament; and then, passing on to Bresci, the assassin of Humbert, acknowledges him as an Anarchist propagandist, and accepts his "method" as entirely proper:

"And over there in his coffin cell in Italy lies the man whose method was to kill a king and shock the nations into a sudden consciousness of the hollowness of their law and order. Him, too, him and his act, without reserve I accept, and bend in silent acknowledgment of the strength of the man. For there are some whose nature it is to think and plead, and yield, and yet return to the address and so make headway in the minds of their fellowmen; and there are others who are stern and still, resolute, implacable as Judah's dream of God; and those men strike—strike once and have ended. But the blow resounds across the world. And as on a night when the sky is heavy with storm some sudden great white flare sheets across it and every object starts sharply out, so in the flash of Bresci's pistol shot the whole world for a moment saw the tragic figure of the Italian people, starved, stunted, crippled, huddled, degraded, murdered; and at the same moment that their teeth chattered with fear, they came and asked the Anarchists to explain themselves. And hundreds of thousands of people read more in those few days than they had ever read of the idea before."

In conclusion, the lecturer speeds her parting hearers with this significant suggestion: "Each choose that method which expresses your selfhood best, and condemn no other man because he expresses his Self otherwise." And the obvious interpretation of this is, simply, that if any of her auditors have a murderous bent, let them not hesitate to give it sweep.

Here, then, is the real content, the true significance, of Anarchism as it exists about us to-day; and it is important for us to discuss the subject in a practical sense, and not from an academic viewpoint that regards a theoretical Anarchism which has little real likeness to the actual thing.

CHARLES P. NEILL.

Washington, D. C.

Scientific Chronicle.

RECENT TESTS OF HIGH EXPLOSIVES.

The daily press has recently published extracts from a report of a board appointed by Congress to test the Gathmann gun. At the head of the board was Major Knight, of the corps of engineers. The tests were made at the Sandy Hook proving grounds, and the report has been laid before Congress by Secretary Root. The summing up of the report is as follows:

"After a careful consideration of the effect of the various impacts on the respective targets of the Gathmann gun and the 12-inch army service rifle, the board finds that none of the impacts from the Gathmann gun would have endangered a modern battleship; that the Gathmann system is not effective as a means of attacking armored vessels, and that any one of the shots from the 12-inch army service rifle would have wrought serious injury to a modern battleship as regards its buoyancy, the interior mechanism and the armament and the personnel.

"It may be said in this connection that the destructive effect of the 12-inch army service rifle surpasses anything hitherto obtained from any gun as far as this board has knowledge or as the records show.

"There is nothing in the Gathmann system to recommend its adoption in the public service of the United States or to warrant further experiments."

This summing up, which appeared in many of the daily papers, was accompanied in many instances with the statement that the Gathmann gun was useless, that the Gathmann gun was a failure, and the like. These comments are in the light of the facts in the case exaggerations. In the tests it did not fail, but proved that it was exceedingly effective. It was, however, surpassed by its competitor, and hence the failure was one by comparison; it failed to win, although it did remarkably fine work.

There have been for a long time two schools among experimenters divided in their opinion as to the most effective way of destroying armored vessels by means of high explosives. One school claimed that all that was necessary was to explode a large amount of gun-cotton against the side or deck of the vessel to blow in the structure and sink the ship. The other school held that high explosives detonated on the outside of the armored battleship would be com-

paratively ineffective and that the only way was to carry these explosives in armor-piercing shells through the armor and explode them in the interior of the vessel.

At Sandy Hook both methods were tested under precisely the same conditions. Two face-hardened armor plates, each 16 feet long by $7\frac{1}{2}$ feet by $11\frac{1}{2}$ inches in thickness, manufactured under the Krupp patents, were mounted so as to represent a section of the side of the battleship Iowa. Behind each plate was a 6-inch oak backing, then a $\frac{5}{8}$ -inch steel plate, which was supported by four vertical plate frames of the same dimensions as those which back up the armor at the water-line of the Iowa. Behind these was another plate reproducing the interior skin of the vessel. Back of this plate were four vertical 14 by 14-inch oak posts set up on four longitudinal posts of the same dimensions and braced diagonally by struts of like dimensions. These oak struts were completely buried in a backing of sand filled in to the height of the target and sloping backwards a distance of 40 or 50 feet. Against two such plates identical in make and supported in precisely the same way the two contending methods were tested.

Three of the Gathmann shells were fired. The first shot struck the centre of the target with a velocity of 1,660 feet per second. Only a partial detonation took place and the shell failed to make any impression on the plate. The second shot hit the plate with the same velocity, detonated more fully, but neither penetrated nor cracked the plate. This shot hit near the right-hand edge of the plate. Just at this point the plate lacked the support it would have if it formed a part of the continuous armor of a ship, and lacking this support it was forced backwards about 35 inches and to the left about 12 inches. The third shot hit the left-hand edge of the plate with a velocity of 2,100 feet, and the detonation was complete. The striking energy of the shell, together with the explosive force of the guncotton, forced back the plate, the backing, the timber struts and the sand backing, a mass of about 700 tons a distance of 8 feet to the rear and 8 feet to the left. The plate was broken in two near the end furthest from the point of impact. This break was not due to the explosive force, but to the transverse bending stress. The work done by the 500 pounds of guncotton argues anything but failure. The expert opinion, however, was that this result would not have been produced had the plate the support that it would have had as a part of the continuous armor of a vessel, and therefore it was inferior to that produced by the explosive in an armor-piercing shell.

This effect was shown in the other set of tests. The first round was a 1,000 pound armor-piercing shot with about 20 pounds of explosive. It struck the plate in the centre and exploded as it

passed through. It tore a conical-shaped hole through the latter half of the plate and the fragments of the plate and shell swept through the steel backing, cutting the oak struts and blowing a large cavity out of the sand backing. In the second round 25 pounds of maxinite were used. It struck towards the right-hand edge, penetrated the plate, exploding as it passed through. The plate was completely wrecked, being cracked through both vertically and horizontally. An additional portion of the sand heap was also blown away. For the third round they took 65 pounds of explosive, which struck the target with a velocity of 2,000 feet, a velocity 200 feet in excess of that of the first shots. With ordinary explosive the shell would have been helpless against the 11½-inch plate. It struck towards the left-hand side of the plate, tore out a section weighing about one ton and a half and swept it, together with its own fragments and those of the backing, through the great sand heap and landed it at a distance of 200 feet to the rear of the target. The description in the *Scientific American* for November 30, from which these facts are taken, concludes: "After a personal inspection of this target, or rather what was left of it, we felt satisfied that in a duel, at point-blank range, a vessel armed with these high-explosive armor-piercing shells would have her opponent completely at her mercy. Any one of these shells bursting within a barbette would kill every man within it, and if it burst within a central rapid-fire battery, it would unquestionably paralyze the gun detachments, if it did not disable every gun within the battery."

While the results obtained at Sandy Hook go on record as the most remarkable yet reached in any country in the world, they at the same time, in the opinion of experts, settle the dispute as to the best way of attacking armored vessels in favor of the armor-piercing shell with high explosive that by means of a time fuse is delayed in exploding until it has entered the vessel.

WIRELESS TELEGRAPHY.

The activity with which wireless telegraphy is being applied to practical purposes is an encouraging argument for the future utility of this mode of communication. The successful communication between warships at sea, between merchant vessels and the shore and between land stations over two hundred miles apart is evidence of the rapid advance that is making in wireless telegraphy. The

success of the installation on Nantucket Island has been referred to frequently in the daily press.

At Siasconset on the island is a mast which carries 180 feet of vertical wire. In a cottage near the base of the mast the receiving and transmitting instruments are housed. On the Nantucket Shoals lightship, stationed about forty miles south of Siasconset, a similar outfit is placed.

By means of the apparatus on the lightship communication with the steamship *Lucania* was possible while that vessel was still 72 miles east of Nantucket. Within half an hour after the vessel communicated with the lightship she was in communication with New York, a distance of 200 miles. The messages were sent through the shore station on Nantucket.

This success reduces by half a day the time a transatlantic steamer is cut off from communication with the outside world.

Not long ago the *Lucania* on her trip eastward communicated with the *Campania* in mid-ocean and going in the opposite direction. During the time of communication the shortest distance between them was 33 miles and the longest 65. When during a recent fog the *Lucania* did not arrive at her New York dock on time, the agent of the company had the Marconi operator on the *Umbria*, which was then at the dock, try if he could communicate with her. As soon as the instruments on the *Umbria* were set going, a message came back from the *Lucania* stating that she was anchored outside the bar waiting for the fog to lift. Similar results are every day pointing to the practical use that may be made of this mode of communication.

There is, however, one point which has not yet been satisfactorily met, and that is selective wireless telegraphy. That is, at present, it is not feasible to send two messages at once. This was demonstrated in the reporting of the recent yacht races. There were three different systems at work to report these races. The Associated Press had a complete set of Marconi apparatus for the purpose, and everything was in first-class working condition. They transmitted messages which were received quickly and accurately at the land station, which was in the hotel at Long Beach, L. I. The rate of transmission was about twelve words per minute, and the greatest distance was about twenty miles.

The Publishers' Press Association at the same time and for the same purpose put in operation what is known as the de Forest system. The difficulty of selective signaling was brought out by the fact that in order to avoid interference when the systems were worked simultaneously it was agreed that they should operate their respective machines successively and alternately every five minutes.

Under this arrangement both systems seemed to have worked well, until a third and unexpected operator began to send messages. While he was sending out waves from his transmitter the other two systems were crippled. This brings out the fact that any system of wireless telegraphy to operate successfully must at present have a monopoly of the land, air and water. As this cannot be secured, some selective system is imperative whereby the messages will not interfere with each other. In experimental work in this direction something has been achieved, but as yet it is not applicable in practice.

Those interested in the success of wireless telegraphy are looking forward to the report which Mr. Marconi has promised of the result of the experiments which he is at present conducting near St. John's, Newfoundland. Among other things he is quoted as follows with regard to his work there: "My principal object is to make experiments so as to ascertain the relative values of different positions along the coast, with a view of locating one of our stations near St. John's. I have brought with me two balloons of about 15,000 cubic feet capacity. They will be used to suspend the vertical wires.

"In making these experiments I shall closely study the rock formation of the coast, for if it is found that good results can be obtained in Newfoundland, the knowledge gained about the physical character of the ground will be a guide to me in locating stations elsewhere. Certain kinds of rock formations are more favorable than others, better results in the way of long-distance signaling being obtained.

"After two or three tests at Signal Hill I intend to move the whole apparatus to Cape Spear, about five miles south of St. Johns, and experiment there, afterward making comparisons between the tests. A permanent station will be erected at the most favorable locality.

"I hope before we leave to be able to receive and send messages 250 or 300 miles or even further, but, of course, I cannot definitely say what may be done, as the weather may have a detrimental effect on the experiments."

The location selected for the experiments will undoubtedly give all desirable variety of bad weather to fully test the value of this mode of communication. If success crowns this work, the station erected will be one of a chain of stations to be erected along the Atlantic coast. At present there are forty stations fully equipped in different parts of Europe and five in America. The new station at South Wellfleet, back of Cape Cod, is a link in this chain of stations. About three weeks ago in a severe gale seven of the ten poles that surrounded the low brick receiving station were blown down and the building itself narrowly escaped destruction. While no reports that are authentic have been received with regard to the

work at these stations, still we can be certain that results important for etheric telegraphy will soon be announced.

GRAPHIC REPRESENTATION OF PECULIARITIES OF STYLE.

In an interesting article in the *Popular Science Monthly* for December Dr. T. C. Mendenhall shows in a very striking way the utility of mechanical curves in representing peculiarities of literary style and with such a degree of fidelity that the graphic representation may become a means of identifying the author of a given production.

In the study presented in this article the method was restricted to the relative frequencies of words of different lengths. The graphic representation of the result is made by the system of rectangular coördinates. Figures expressing the number of letters are placed in succession at equal intervals along the horizontal axis. Above these numbers and on a vertical line a point is placed at a height which indicates the number of words of that length which were found in the portion of the author selected. These points are then connected by a continuous line which is the curve sought.

It is with great pleasure that one finds in this article an application of this method to the Bacon-Shakespeare controversy. For this test Mr. Augustus Heminway, of Boston, defrayed the expenses of those employed to count and classify nearly two millions of words. About 400,000 words of Shakespeare were counted and classified. His characteristic curve was found to be most persistent, the curve based on the first 50,000 words differing little from that of the whole count. From a study of the curve it is evident that the most frequent use of the four-letter word is a characteristic of Shakespeare. It was thought that this might be a characteristic of the writers of his time, but this was found not to be the case.

Having proved that an author agrees with himself very accurately when curves are plotted from different groups of words taken from different parts of his works or from different parts of the same work, a fact graphically portrayed in the two curves of groups of words from Ben Jonson which are almost identical, and having shown, at least in one interesting case, that even when an author tries to change his style that still his peculiarities will show in the curve, the curves from Shakespeare and Bacon were compared. The two lines

show extraordinary differences. In Bacon the three-letter word is used most frequently. This is a characteristic of writers of English. In the number of writers studied before the plotting of Shakespeare, the only exception found was John Stuart Mill. His use of the two-letter word is eminently characteristic. This comes from the frequent use of prepositional phrases. The study of groups of 5,000 words from two different periods of his life reveal the same peculiarity.

As marked peculiarities always assert themselves, even when the writer composes in prose and poetry, writes history, essays or dramas, even when he tries to vary his style, the great disagreement of the Bacon and Shakespeare curves, if the method is a good test, throws Bacon out when there is a question of the authorship of the works attributed to Shakespeare.

Mr. Edward Atkinson gave the opportunity of testing whether an author can purposely hide his peculiarities. The case is thus stated by the writer: "Mr. Atkinson, having addressed a body of college alumni on a certain topic, afterward gave what he meant to be the same address to a body of workingmen, but in the latter instance he made a special effort to use simple, short words and sentences of the simplest and plainest construction. Although relating to the same topic the two addresses 'read' very differently, but their diagrams are strikingly alike in their main feature."

A surprise was in store for those engaged in the work when they came to plot the curve of the plays of Christopher Marlowe. It was found that Marlowe agrees as well with Shakespeare as Shakespeare agrees with himself. It has always been acknowledged that Shakespeare was deeply indebted to Marlowe, and some critics have declared that he might have written the plays of Shakespeare. A book has been published recently to prove this declaration. This coincidence does not, however, give a conclusive proof of the identity of Marlowe and the writer of the plays of Shakespeare. It might well happen that both caught the same spirit and style. An incident in point is that cited by the writer in the *Popular Science Monthly*. It is thus given: "an interesting incident developed in an examination of a bit of dramatic composition by Professor Shaler, of Harvard University, entitled 'Armada Days.' It was a brochure of only about twenty thousand words, printed for private circulation, in which the author had endeavored to compose in the spirit and style of the Elizabethan age. Although too small to produce anything like a normal curve it was counted and plotted and the diagram indicated that Professor Shaler had not only caught the spirit of the literature of the time, but that he had also unconsciously adopted the mechanism which seems to characterize it. In the

excess of the four-letter word and in other respects the curve was rather decidedly Shakespearean, although it was written before its author knew anything of such an analysis as this."

After giving the facts obtained by the method adopted Mr. Mendenhall leaves the conclusions to the reader. If to some it appears that Bacon is thrown out of the discussion in which he has so long figured, it is only to make room for Marlowe. This method then can never settle the question, who did write the plays of Shakespeare? It can at best never do more than direct inquiry or suspicion. The results obtained have been looked forward to for twenty years by Mr. Mendenhall, for the opportunity described above enabled him to test a method which he devised at that time. The test of this method will certainly always prove interesting and in many ways will give results of value in linguistic studies.

WIRE GRASS.

There are fully a million acres of marsh land, following the glacial belt and extending from the Ohio river far into the British Northwest. The cost of reclaiming this vast tract for the cultivation of higher plants is prohibitive. It is useless for grazing and feeding purposes, for the wire grass that grows there is tough and devoid of nutritive substance. Hence for years these lands have been considered worse than useless.

A study of wire grass, known to the botanist as *Carex stricta*, shows that it possesses a peculiarly strong, durable and workable fiber. Unlike other grasses its stem is not jointed. It has no lateral leaves, but the round stem grows up straight from the ground to a height of from three to four feet. As it grows in peat and bog marshes, in which there is a small supply of mineral matter, it lacks mineral substances and hence is pithy and tough and retains its pliability indefinitely. Wire grass is in fact valuable only for fiber.

This suggested to some the possibility of using it for binder twine, and the invention by George A. Lowry of a machine for spinning grass twine was the beginning of a new and large industry. This twine began to be manufactured on a commercial scale in November, 1897, at Oshkosh, Wis. New fields soon opened up for the use of this fiber, and to-day various interests are united in the American Grass Twine Company, which owns and leases large tracts of land on which wire grass grows.

The grass is harvested in much the same way in which wheat is harvested. The early harvest is cut by a self-raking reaper, which lays the grass in heaps on the field, where it cures for about twenty-four hours, when it is gathered into bundles and tied by a machine designed for that purpose. The weather does not affect the harvest, as rain does not in any way damage the grass. It is then gathered into great stacks protected from the rain and snow, where it goes through the sweat or ordinary curing process. The grass is then baled and stored in warehouses, whence it is shipped to the factories for use. In the *Scientific American Supplement*, to which we are indebted for these facts, it is stated that over 2,000 men are engaged in the harvesting and that last year the area harvested was larger than that harvested by any individual or corporation in America.

In treating the grass the first operation is that of combing. During this operation the short stems and extraneous matter are separated from the long grass. As the latter comes from the comber it is tied up in ten-pound bundles, each blade being clean, straight and of a bright green color, a fiber between three and four feet long.

It next passes through the spinning machine, where the fibers are drawn out and laid end to end, in which condition they are drawn through the presses. As they pass through the presses they are given the proper twist to make them a continuous cord or twine. This twine is then roped with a thread of cotton, flax or hemp to keep the ends from projecting and to render the twine smooth and even.

Especially adapted looms weave the wire grass twine into matting, rugs, carpet linings, floor deadenings, etc. As the process of treatment from the cutting of the grass to the finished article for use is purely mechanical, the natural strength and pliability of the fiber is in no way weakened. Moreover, it retains the beautiful surface and color of the perfect grass.

In a large factory in Brooklyn, N. Y., this fiber is used in the manufacture of chairs, settees, tables, screens, doors, baby carriages, music and flower stands, baskets and other novelties. Even the short blades which are removed at the comber are utilized for bottle covers. Thus some idea may be formed of the extent of this new industry and of the utility of what was regarded as a useless growth on still more useless land.

ELECTRICITY IN THE MANUFACTURE OF GLASS.

Among the other numerous applications of the electric current is its use in an electric furnace for the purpose of glass making. Dr. Brembach describes, in a recent number of the *Electrochemische Zeit-*

schrift, a furnace suitable for this object. Hitherto the mixture of silica and alkalies was either placed in clay pots arranged within a furnace and the heat was applied externally to the pots from an adjacent grate, or the mixture was fused on the hearth of a reverberatory furnace by gas firing.

With the introduction of the electric furnace the material will be fused in an electric arc. While the fusing of material in an electric arc is not new, still the application of the electric arc to glass making introduces some new features which distinguish it from the well-known use of the arc in the manufacture of carborundum and calcium carbide. In these latter cases the material is arranged as a charge in the furnace, the electric current is turned on and continues to flow until the operation is completed. The current is then turned off, the mass is allowed to cool, after which it is removed and a new charge is placed in the furnace. Such a furnace is evidently intermittent in its operation. Attempts have been made to construct a continuously working furnace, but as yet they do not seem to be practical.

In the furnace described by Dr. Brembach the material is fed to and the fused glass is drawn off from the furnace in a continuous stream. This is effected by an ingenious arrangement of three electric arcs at different heights along an inclined plane. The material previously crushed and thoroughly mixed is fed by gravity to the first arc. Here the first fusing of the material takes place and the fused mass flows into a pocket just below the first arc. From this pocket it overflows to the second arc, where a more thorough fusion occurs. From a second pocket it flows to the third arc, where it is converted into a perfectly fluid glass. This glass flows into a collecting pot, from which it can be taken for use.

The carbon electrodes used are prepared by impregnating them with various salts in solutions of soda, potash, sodium sulphate, etc. This treatment of the carbons makes it possible to obtain a long arc with a current of comparatively low pressure. This preparation of the electrodes, together with the fact that melted glass is a good conductor of electricity, enables the manufacturer to work with a current having a pressure of 40 volts. One hundred amperes will be required for each of the first two arcs and fifty for the third. The current employed is the alternating, for the direct current would decompose the material.

It is evident that the size of a glass-making plant is considerably reduced by the introduction of the electric process, and if the new method be adopted in a locality where water power is available for the generation of the electric current the cost of production will be greatly reduced.

The operation is, moreover, under complete control. It may be stopped at any moment by simply turning off the electric current and cutting off the flow of material. It can be started as readily, for the great heat of the arc produces an immediate fusion of the powdered materials.

SOLAR ACTIVITY AND CLIMATIC CHANGES.

The sun may be regarded as a variable star, its luminous radiation undergoing periodic variations within narrow limits. It has been known for some time that the mean period between the maximum and minimum of sunspots is eleven years. This, then, is the period between minimum and maximum radiation. Superimposed upon this period there is, according to Sir Norman Lockyer, a further period of approximately thirty-five years. He brought this out in an address before the Royal Society of Great Britain in a paper on the "Solar Activity During the Period 1833-1900."

It is natural to expect that cyclic changes in the activity of the sun would repeat themselves in the earth's meteorology. Still, the changes in the seasons from decade to decade are so small that they escape ordinary observation and can be detected only by a study of observations which extend over long periods. Hence it is of interest to know whether meteorological observations reveal a corresponding periodic change in the climate of the earth.

In analyzing the observations of magnetic variations the influence of both the eleven-year cycle and a thirty-five year cycle is indicated. Moreover, in examining the frequency curve of the aurora borealis a thirty-five year cycle is shown.

The most interesting coincidence, however, is discovered in a study of Professor Bruckner's examination of meteorological records for the past 200 years. He finds that there is a small periodic variation in the climates of the earth in a period of very nearly thirty-five years. From his work it is also clear that there is also a thirty-five year period between maximum and minimum rainfall, there being a slight increase in the rainfall during maximum sunspot development, and on the contrary a reduced rainfall when the sunspot development is least. In addition to these very striking agreements between the variation of solar activity and that of our climate we might add the conclusion reached by Professor Richter that there is a thirty-five year period in the movements of glaciers.

Although the thirty-five year period of Mr. Lockyer cannot be

said to be yet fully established, still should subsequent observations confirm it, its utility to the community in the predetermination of weather and climate cannot be overestimated. Its importance should lead to further investigations in this direction.

TANNIN.

The steady increase of the world's population and the diffusion of civilization has caused a steady increase in the consumption of leather. In the preparation of leather tannin is required. The chief source of tannin up to the present has been the oak and hemlock trees, which require about fifteen years to mature sufficiently to permit of their bark being stripped off without injury to the tree. When all precaution has been taken the tree usually dies. Gambier, sumac and their extracts are also used. But these sources of supply did not keep pace with the demand for tannin in the preparation of leather. All danger of a deficit in this important article is, however, removed by the introduction of a new source of supply which can be cultivated with comparative ease and which yields a high percentage of tannin.

This new source is canaigre. This is a plant which can be harvested in crop form annually. Canaigre is a bulb or tuber like the potato, growing under ground and sending up a stalk with large leaves to the height of from fifteen inches to three feet above the surface. The roots contain about forty per cent. of tannic acid. The first supply of tannic acid from this plant was taken from the wild canaigre until this supply was so depleted that it was no longer profitable to collect the scattered wild plants for this purpose. Only then did they think of cultivating it. Experiments made by the Arizona Agricultural Department at the experimental station at Phoenix, Arizona, under the direction of Professor F. A. Gulley showed that the plant could be cultivated. This conclusion was confirmed by the bold venture of J. B. Carruthers in planting 1,000 acres in the valley of the Salt river. The venture was a success and the crop was sold in advance. The Anglo-American Canaigre Company has 8,000 acres planted in the San Bernardino Valley of California. This means that a wild and little known root has by science been developed into a standard article of commerce and a recognized article in the great leather industry.

D. T. O'SULLIVAN, S. J.

Book Notices.

CONCILIUM TRIDENTINUM. Diariorum, Actorum, Epistularum, Tractatum Nova Collectio. Edidit Societas Goerresiana. Tomus Primus: Diariorum Pars Prima. Friburgi Brisgoviae: Sumptibus Herder, 1901. Price, \$18.00 net.

Nothing could better illustrate the great change which has taken place in the methods of historical research during the last generation than the gigantic undertaking of Herder to publish all the original documents relating to the Council of Trent, the first volume of which lies before us in a magnificent quarto of over nine hundred pages. To both the publisher and the illustrious Goerres Society, which has undertaken the work of editorship, the task can be nothing else than a labor of love, for they cannot have embarked upon it with any reasonable prospect of financial gain. It is a work the sale of which will be almost exclusively confined to public libraries: for how many private students can afford to pay the price which it has been necessary to set upon it? But no institution of learning can afford to be deprived of it, as it will always be one of the first works to be sought for in libraries by students of ecclesiastical history.

In the estimation of scholars of previous generations the history of the Council of Trent had been thoroughly threshed out. It was, indeed, a twice-told tale, having been narrated *in extenso* by a virulent enemy, Fra Paolo Sarpi, and by a strenuous advocate, the Jesuit Cardinal Pallavicino. Neither of these writers had given perfect satisfaction; their antagonistic "tendencies" were apparent on every page. But in those days people loved their pet "tendencies" as much as they now admire the ardent partisanship of their daily newspaper. To the Protestant, Fra Paolo was a holy father of modern times, the very incarnation of progress, and his brilliant invective against Rome ranked in importance next after the Bible; and, to do him justice, it must be owned that this Venetian Friar was the most dangerous serpent that the Church of Christ ever warmed into life in her maternal bosom. The Catholic, on the other hand, rose from a perusal of the elaborate work of Cardinal Pallavicino with the feeling that the great Jesuit had pulverized his adversary and had exhausted both the subject and the reader. It does not surprise us, therefore, to hear that the prospect of being compelled to wade through an indefinite number of new volumes on the Council awakened dismay in some of the scholars of the old school. Dr. Merkle, to whom the Goerres Society committed the

work of editing the first volumes of the new collection of documents, tells us in his preface, with a quiet suggestion of humor, of the effect of the intelligence on "a certain popular German writer of an ecclesiastical history" residing in Rome. This good man, when informed of the Society's intention of publishing all the documents pertaining to the Council, cried out in a tone twixt pity and contempt: "Quid novi elicitori estis? an Sarpium vultis confutare?" This describes graphically the mental attitude of a man who was willing to obtain his information at second hand and who had read so much *about* the great Council that the subject palled upon him. How different was the case with Bishop Hefele, who announced in the seventh volume of his "History of the Councils" that he would not attempt the story of Trent, not only because of his advancing age, but chiefly because he could not gain access to the *Acta* hidden away in the secret archives of the Vatican. Ranke, too, in an extended critique of Sarpi and Pallavicino, annexed to his "History of the Popes" (Vol. III., pp. 103-138, Bohn translation), states his reasons why, in his opinion, the true story of the Council must ever remain untold. His words, written nearly seventy years ago, are worth repeating:

"Would any one now undertake a new history of the Council of Trent—a thing which is not to be very confidently expected, since the subject has lost much of its interest—he must begin anew from the very commencement. He must collect the several negotiations, of which very little that is authentic has been made known; he must also procure the despatches of one or other of the ambassadors who were present. Then only could he obtain a complete view of his subject, or be in a condition to examine the two antagonistic writers who have already attempted this history. But this is an undertaking that will never be entered on, since those who could certainly do it have no wish to see it done, and will therefore not make the attempt, and those who might desire to accomplish it do not possess the means."

These pessimistic remarks of the great Protestant historian remind us of similar expressions found in the preface of his history. He there admits that his work would have been fuller and more satisfactory if he could have obtained access to the treasures concealed in the secret archives of the Popes. "But was it to be expected," he says with philosophic resignation, "that a foreigner, and one professing a different faith, would then be permitted to have free access to the public collections for the purpose of revealing the secrets of the Papacy?" In the year 1836, when Ranke penned these lines, this would have seemed preposterous; for at that period the archives not only of Rome, but of all the powers, were jealously concealed from the eyes of the curious. Historians at that time received pretty

much the same treatment which is accorded at the present day to the prying representatives of the press. Even such official defenders of the Holy See as Pallavicino and Rainaldi were permitted to see and examine only such extracts from the documents as the wise custodians of said documents deemed essential to the purpose. Ranke's common sense view of the subject is very pertinent, and not devoid of humor. The policy of permitting students, even foreigners and Protestants, to see these much-guarded documents, he says, "would not perhaps have been so ill-advised as it may appear, since no search can bring to light anything worse than what is already assumed by unfounded conjecture, and received by the world as established truth. But," he continues with a sigh, "I cannot boast of having had any such permission."

Needless to say, the enlightened policy of our gloriously reigning Pontiff, Leo XIII., has frustrated the pessimistic prophecy of Ranke, as also the famous dictum of Leibnitz regarding Burchard's Diary: *latet, aeternumque latebit*. If Ranke could now repeat his visit to the Eternal City he would find every door thrown open to him, and a numerous body of scholars willing to guide him in his researches. As his historical genius led him to surmise, the results of this liberal policy would have been visible in a more sympathetic treatment of his subject.

As Dr. Merkle points out in his admirable *prolegomena*, it had been far from the original intention of the Holy See to suppress the *Acta* of the Council of Trent. In fact, the secretary of the Council had received the commission to draw up his notes for publication. Circumstances caused the matter to drag along until the death of the secretary, Mossarelli. Meanwhile the interest in the subject began to flag, and new views regarding the opportuneness of the publication prevailed. A prominent element in bringing about the resolution to lock up the *Acta* was the dread of giving any handle of attack to the virulent and unscrupulous foes of the Church who would not fail to gloat over and exaggerate every exhibition of human infirmity on the part of the fathers of the Council.

Now, however, under the auspices of the Goerres Society (which represents the best talent of united Catholic Germany) and with the approval and benediction of the Supreme Pontiff (who inaugurates the work with a special brief couched in terms of the warmest laudation), the great Council reappears just as it really was, and we are not compelled to study it through Sarpian or Pallavicinian spectacles.

The first volume contains the original notes or commentaries, made day by day by Severali, the *promotor*, and by Massarelli, the secretary of the Council, the whole enriched by the copious annota-

tions of the learned editor, Dr. Merkle, and brought out in all the typographical beauty which we are grown accustomed to expect from the press of Herder.

LUKE DELMEGE. By Rev. P. A. Sheehan, author of "My New Curate," etc. 8vo., pp. 580. New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

The readers of *The American Ecclesiastical Review* will recognize in Luke Delmege an old friend from whom they have but recently parted. They will be glad, no doubt, to meet him again in a new form. Some persons never read a serial story, because the connection is broken so often that the interest is not kept up. Sometimes a reader who is a busy person and has many distractions, does not remember previous chapters that are referred to later, and that are necessary for a complete understanding of the subject. For such persons serials are not unalloyed pleasures, and the appearance of the finished story is a joy. The writer of the present notice must confess that although he read the history of Luke Delmege as it appeared in the *Ecclesiastical*, he was very much disappointed when the last chapter closed without completing the life of the hero. When he took up the finished story he learned that the hero had died in the first chapter or introduction.

This experience might suggest the question, is the author's plan a good one? Perhaps the writer was slightly prejudiced by the confession of the author that his story was made to order and hastily. He imagined that he saw evidences of this several times as the work progressed, and although he enjoyed the story as a whole, and admired the brightness and learning and power of the author, he could not altogether avoid regretting that "My New Curate" was not permitted to occupy the field alone for awhile. We are not satisfied with only reading a good book; we want to dwell on it afterwards, and recall its scenes and talk about its characters.

And then there is the inevitable comparison—not altogether fair, perhaps, but inevitable. Is it not better for an author who has achieved a success to wait until his triumph is complete before trying for new honors?

"Luke Delmege" will not be as popular as "My New Curate," because it is not so human, and because the hand of the teacher is more apparent in its pages. The hero will not excite as much sympathy, because his mistakes are too continuous for a man of his ability, and sometimes they seem to be very inconsistent with a man of his piety. For instance, it is very hard to understand how any priest of piety and learning, who had been ordained for seventeen years, and had been engaged in the active work of the ministry all

the time, could so far forget himself as to repulse a young woman whom he found among the penitents in the House of the Good Shepherd, and whom he had known in former years as a person of good family, education, refinement and virtue. Even if she were all that her dress and environment seemed to indicate, she had been a professed penitent for ten years, and yet we are told that instead of stretching out his hand and saying a kind word of farewell to her, whom he should never see again, he was only tempted to do so, "but one side glance at that ill-made, coarse, bulky dress of penitence deterred him. He bowed stiffly and said good-day with a frown. Barbara continued staring blindly through the window. Then slowly, as her heart broke under the agony, her hot tears fell, burned her hand and blistered the book which she held."

As we read this passage the house of Simon the Pharisee rose up before us, and we saw Magdalen at the feet of Jesus. Then we tried to imagine an educated, pious priest with seventeen years of experience acting like Luke Delmege. Can this be good art? Does it not lack the first quality of all art, truth to nature?

In the same chapter we see the hero cited before his bishop to answer the charge of denying the sacramental system and denouncing the use of the ordinary means sanctioned by the Church for the sanctification of the faithful, and insisting on the individual power of self-sanctification, apart from the ordinary channels of divine grace. What bishop would be so silly as to entertain a charge of that kind against a learned pious man of unblemished character and unquestioned zeal, coming from an unknown accuser, or a drunken, ignorant fellow who was angry because he was rightly corrected? When we read the passage we were tempted to think that the bishop ought to be suspended for entertaining such a charge under such circumstances.

But "Luke Delmege" is a delightful and instructive book, notwithstanding these blemishes and some others which we have not space to notice. We were surprised to find ourselves reading it a second time when we took it up only for a glance.

THE FAITH OF THE MILLIONS. A Selection of Past Essays. By *George Tyrrell, S. J.* Two volumes, first and second series. 8vo., pp. xxv., 344, 369. London and New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

As the title page states, this is a collection of past essays. They have all appeared in the *Month*, except those on "The Use of Scholasticism" and on "The True and the False Mysticism." The former appeared, as "The Church and Scholasticism," in *The American Catholic Quarterly Review*, and the latter in *The American Ecclesiastical Review*. The author informs us that he wishes it to be under-

stood that this selection of articles published up to date is to be taken as a repudiation, for one reason or another, of those not selected—whether it be for faults in style or for inaccuracies or obscurities in statement. In his introduction the author lays down certain principles which should guide those who are trying to lead the millions to the true faith and preserve them in it. He says that “so far as the following essays have any unity it is as constituting a most imperfect effort to give effect to the principles here advocated. They are, as every patient and intelligent reader will see, entirely conservative in their aim and spirit; for “‘liberal’ and ‘conservative’ are terms that have reference to the end by which, as the scholastics say, a movement is specified or characterized.”

He does not agree with those who think that in order to bring the faith to the multitude, we should make efforts “to meet the religious questionings of the semi-educated in a way adapted rather to their incapacity than to the demands of the better informed and more cultivated minds. We hold, however, that this can be at most a temporary palliative, but never a radical remedy against the spreading epidemic of unbelief. Sand-barriers may retard the advancing tide here and there, but eventually it creeps around and over. History shows us that the beliefs of the masses (we are not dealing with units in this discussion) follow, at a certain distance of time, the beliefs of those who lead or form public opinion—that eventually the many depend upon the few, and the glaciers formed on the hills slip down to the valleys. Hence the constant and wise endeavor of the Church in the interests of the dependent crowds to secure a Christianized public opinion, if not necessarily a Christianized government. At first she drew the multitudes by her miracles, by the death of her martyrs, by the glow of her primitive purity and fervor; nay, even by the very freshness and novelty of her ideas and methods; but as soon as she had captured the leaders of the people—as soon as the Empire was Christianized—the need of these extraordinary credentials ceased with the establishment of the normal and ordinary conditions. Now that the difficulties of the primitive period bid fair to recur, and the power of public opinion is passing over from the side of faith to that of doubt, dragging the fluent multitude after it as the sea is dragged by the moon, it would seem natural to look for remedy either in a renewal of those preternatural energies whence the Church derived that initial impetus on which she has lived ever since; or else in an endeavor to reverse the present current of public opinion by acting upon those who determine it, and not merely on those who are determined by it. But besides the enormous practical difficulty of giving effect to the latter method, there are some other objections to be considered.”

After due consideration of these objections, the essays which make up the two volumes follow. They are twenty-three in number, beginning with one entitled "A More Excellent Way," in which it is shown that in dealing with those outside of the Church, the time for controversy and polemics is past, and that "what is needed now above all things is a clear manifestation of the Catholic religion in its ethical and intellectual beauty; not as *a* religion, but as eminently *the* religion of mankind; as the complement of human nature, the desire of nations; as the one God-given answer to the problem of life and the social problem."

The other essays deal with a variety of subjects, in several instances being reviews of books that demand special attention.

We shall not attempt to say anything of Father Tyrrell's merits as a writer. We have had the pleasure of speaking of them in the highest terms frequently in these pages. He is always clear, elegant, interesting and instructive. We quite agree with a writer in the *Month*, who said when reviewing these essays, that no one since Newman has appealed more strongly to cultivated minds.

ROADS TO ROME. Being Personal Records of Some of the More Recent Converts to the Catholic Faith. With Introduction by Cardinal Vaughan. Compiled and Edited by the Author of "Ten Years in Anglican Orders." 8vo., pp. viii, 344. New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

Here is a collection of papers, written independently by sixty-five men and women of education, to account for their return to the Catholic Church. It is remarkable in more ways than one. It is surely consoling to learn "of the existence of a religious conviction, capable of creating in men's minds, one after another, and quite independently of each other, a revolution involving the greatest losses in the natural order and oftentimes the most acute personal agony. It challenges the attention of the most languid as it does of the worldly. It is a practical declaration that there are people who really live upon a belief and a hope in the invisible, and who count all as dross to win Christ." It will surely appeal to "the hundreds of thousands, lay and clerical, men and women, who feel that the foundations of Protestantism have been broken down under them; who are secretly asking themselves whether there be any solid and divinely inspired religion; who are half and more than half convinced of the claim of the old Church to their submission. Many of these will eagerly peruse and examine a book full of such personal experiences, in the expectation of obtaining useful and instructive information."

There is no connection among these narratives, nor are they complete histories. They vary in length from one page to twenty pages.

The book is rather "a collection of indications, suggestions, reminiscences and facts. It is a miscellany of episodes, of phases of thought, all ending in the same conclusion. It is a book of sketches of many minds in their search after Divine Truth."

Some persons may wonder because the reasons given by the writers do not all appeal to them, but they should remember that these reasons are not complete. In many cases only what prompted the last step in a long journey is mentioned. Let it not be forgotten that faith is a gift which cannot be won by argument or controversy. It is not surprising then if the reason which leads one person into the true Church does not appeal at all to another. Cardinal Vaughan states this truth very nicely in the Introduction. He says: "Some persons may expect to find the gift of Faith within the covers of this volume. They will be disappointed. They will not find it within any volume, not even within the volume of the Gospels. Divine Faith is a supernatural gift. It is as a direct a gift of God as the created human soul. The latter is never created until certain definite antecedent conditions have been laid by man; and the former is never bestowed until man has fulfilled the conditions required for the reception of the gift of Faith. These conditions are ordinarily: Correspondence with God's light and invitation, prayer, humility and self-denial." "The present volume is an unconscious record of the fulfilment of these conditions."

THE PRE-COLUMBIAN DISCOVERY OF AMERICA BY THE NORTHMEN, with Translations from the Icelandic Sagas. By *B. F. De Costa*. Third edition revised. 8vo., pp. 230, with Index. Albany: Joel Munsell's Sons.

"The chief aim of this work is to place within the reach of the English-reading public every portion of the Icelandic-Sagas relating to the Pre-Columbian Discovery of America by the Northmen, and to indicate the movements by which that discovery was preceded. The reader will, therefore, find in this volume material from the Sagas not to be found in any other work in an English form. The Sagas have been left, in the main, to tell their own story, though the necessary notes and explanations have been added."

This quotation from the Preface makes known to us the purpose of the author, and indicates the importance of his work. The first edition was published in 1868 and soon went out of print. The second followed in 1890, called forth by the progress of discussion and by the near approach of the Columbian celebration. It contained many improvements, and was soon exhausted. The present edition is rendered necessary by the discovery in the Vatican Library at Rome of a number of Papal letters that exhibit the subject in a new light. The testimony of these letters is of the highest value. A translation of them is printed in full at the end of the volume.

The author assures us that he has not changed his views on any important point since the publication of the original work. "Time has only served to strengthen the belief of scholars in the historical character of the Sagas, while geographical studies now point as formerly to New England as one scene of the Northman's exploits, many of which have left no record, though traces of Icelandic occupation may yet be found on the coast between Cape Cod and Nova Scotia."

This work is not intended to detract in any way from the glory of the achievements of Columbus. That were impossible. The purpose is rather to place before the reader the story preceding 1492, which is very interesting and important.

A very high compliment was paid to the work after the publication of the second edition by the historian of the United States, George Bancroft. He informed the author that he had withdrawn his objections to the historic character of the voyages recorded in the Sagas, and that he had struck out reference to the subject in his last work, not only for the reason that he was engaged in condensing the narrative, but because he recognized that he had long been in error. This was an important admission and a high compliment.

The book is most interesting besides being instructive, and the author is to be congratulated on his success in handling so difficult a subject. The historical value of the book is very great.

RENAISSANCE TYPES. By *William Samuel Lilly*. 8vo., pp. xxiv-400. New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

The author informs us in a note at the end of this volume that much of the book appeared in the *Quarterly Review*, and that one chapter is, to a large extent, reprinted from his work entitled "Chapters in European History."

The present volume is divided into seven chapters. The first treats of "The Genesis of the Renaissance," and the last is devoted to "The Results of the Renaissance."

At the close of the first chapter the author says: "In the next five chapters I propose to consider some of the more marked characteristics of the period as revealed to us by five great men who may be taken to be types of it. . . . History has been called the essence of innumerable biographies. The vast majority of them, of course, tell the same monotonous tale. But in the lives of great men the spirit of the age in which they worked is, in some sort, incarnate, and so may be most fruitfully studied. . . . And so it appears to me that if we carefully consider the careers of Michael Angelo, Erasmus, Reuchlin, Luther and Sir Thomas More, we shall find

abundant light upon the astonishing epoch of transition in which their lot was cast."

The author calls attention to the difficulty of finding a historian who is altogether impartial. "In history, as elsewhere," he says, "the rule of rigid and inflexible justice commends itself to our understanding. But who is so utterly unswayed by prepossession, prejudice, passion, as undeviatingly to follow it? It is by men, not by beings of a higher order, as Schiller laments, that the annals of mankind are written. . . ."

"True is this of historical judgments generally. It is especially true in judging epochs of religious strife. . . . Now, in what I am about to write I shall endeavor to set aside altogether theological tests. I propose to speak of the memorable men who are the subjects of the next five chapters from the point of view of secular history, without trying them or their works by the standards of any school of divinity. It will be for my readers to judge how far I succeed in this undertaking."

Mr. Lilly's reputation as an essayist is sufficient to secure for him a large number of readers, but we fear that his work as a historian will not merit such high commendation, and we are quite sure that as he differs with several standard authorities in his deductions, he will find many readers who will differ with him.

PRACTICAL PREACHING FOR PRIESTS AND PEOPLE. Twenty-five Plain Catholic Sermons on Useful Subjects, with a Synopsis of each Sermon. By *Father Clement Holland*. 12mo., pp. 325. London: Thomas Baker. Philadelphia: John Joseph McVey.

Sermon books are rapidly increasing in number, and like all other classes of books they may be grouped under the heads good, bad and indifferent. The reviewer must be careful in expressing an opinion about them, because so much depends on the purpose and plan of the author, and so much on the mood and needs of the reader.

Some preachers think that all sermon books are bad, because they prevent the individual effort which each preacher should make, and destroy that individuality which is one of the greatest charms of a sermon, and at the same time one of its greatest powers. This is an extreme opinion. The danger does, however, exist, and every preacher should be on his guard against it. If the use of sermon books should tempt any man from thinking out and writing and preaching his own sermons then for him they are an evil indeed.

A second class of preachers approve of good sermon books, because the sermons which they contain serve as models which may be followed by the individual writer and preacher. This is certainly a lawful and wise use of this form of literature, but the pupil must take care to follow only a master.

A third class of preachers approve of sermon books for the busy priest who has not time to prepare his own sermons. There is such a class, but it is very small, and we should be constantly on our guard lest we deceive ourselves and think that we belong to that class. It is so easy to excuse ourselves from the performance of some duty by imagining that we are too busy. But for that small class who are prevented by the performance of other duties from giving to the preparation of their sermons that attention which they require, the good sermon book is a blessing. If a man must use the sermons of others, he should try to find those which he might have written and which will suit the needs and capacity of his hearers. In doubt, let him always choose the short, simple sermon on plain essential truths.

The sermons before us belong to this class. They are on subjects which all without exception should understand; they are written in plain, clear language; they are logical in order, and they are convincing. The synopsis at the beginning of each is very useful, because it enables the preacher to grasp the plan at once, and it serves afterwards as a guide for the memory. We think that these sermons could be very much improved by more frequent quotations from the Sacred Scriptures and the Fathers, and by giving the reference in every instance.

CHURCH BUILDING. A Study of the Principles of Architecture in their Relation to the Church. By *Ralph Adams Cram*. 8vo., pp. 227, copiously illustrated. Boston: Small, Maynard & Co.

The greater portion of the contents of this book appeared originally in serial form in the columns of *The Churchman*. As here printed the chapters have been carefully revised and somewhat enlarged, and a number of new illustrations have been included. The author says that art is the measure of civilization. "We may assert such claims as we choose, if we have not an art that is instinctive, the natural expression of a healthy people, then we protest in vain. We do not possess a genuine, vital civilization."

He declares that such art as we had was hardly worthy of the name until the Centennial Exposition awoke us sufficiently to induce us to begin to create the art which until then had been considered only one of the amenities of life. We do not seem to have made much progress, and this is not so surprising in secular affairs, but what of the Church? "Surely, if there is any power in the world to-day capable of evoking a vital art, demanding art as her true means of outward expression, it is the Church."

"But this is not the case if we are to judge from results, for the

Church here in America does not stand a degree higher than secular powers in her artistic expressions. In fact, she seems even to fall behind. She has created no religious painter, no music, no school of art work, and above all, no logical architecture."

The author then goes on to show why art in every form should be employed in the service of religion, and points out the two great dangers in the way: haste and mere utility. We want to build a church in a year which should require a century, and we think of it rather as the abode of man than as the house of God. He takes up the different kinds of church buildings, beginning with the country chapel and ending with the cathedral, and with the aid of clear text and suitable illustration he points out the right course, and warns us against the wrong.

The book is beautifully made, and should be in the hands of all church builders and those who are interested in their work. They may not always agree with the author, but they must admire his earnestness and commend his zeal.

JOAN OF ARC. By *L. Petit de Julleville*. Translated by Hester Davenport. 12mo., pp. 190. London: Duckworth & Co.

This latter series of the lives of the saints progresses steadily, and already includes about ten volumes. From every point of view they are most attractive. They appeal especially to persons living in the world who desire to advance in perfection, but who do not receive practical encouragement from the history of the saints as it is ordinarily written. In its pages too often we read only of the triumphs of the hero or heroine and learn too little of their temptations and trials. We do not see the whole living person, but only part of him. In the present series the purpose of the writer is to place the saint before us as a living person, in the midst of the very surroundings in which he moved, and to show his relations to the men and events of his time. Far from detracting from the reputation of the saint or diminishing his sanctity, this method serves to bring it out more clearly, as shadows emphasize the brightness of the sun.

We extend a special welcome to the latest volume of the series because it gives us an excellent picture of the glorious Maid of Orleans who has been wronged for centuries. The picture is the more attractive because it brings before us the Venerable Servant of God as she really was.

The writer says: "The life of Joan of Arc has been written by eminent historians, and in these pages it is not our intention to attempt afresh that which has been already well done by them. We shall only recall in a summary manner the political and military

events which composed her wonderful history, and shall speak very briefly of those persons who furthered or hindered her mission. Our object is not to make a study of Charles VII., La Trémoille, the Duke of Alençon, Dunois or of the soldiers, politicians, theologians and prelates—all the contemporaneous history connected with Joan of Arc—but of Joan herself and of Joan only. It is her soul which we wish to try to understand and explain. We shall therefore pay especial attention to her own words, words spoken to her king, to her companions in arms or to her judges. Her own testimony is by far the most trustworthy, simple, candid and expressive, and Joan of Arc still remains the best historian of Joan of Arc.”

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH FROM WITHIN. With Preface by the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster. 8vo., pp. xviii.x396. New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

This is a picture of the Catholic Church from within sketched by a lay hand. “It is written by a member of the laity, by one who has lived for years—from childhood—among men and women of the world; who has mixed freely with Catholics, old and new, as well as with Protestants; who has traveled much, and has also lived much at home, occupied with books as well as with the discharge of many and diverse duties.

“It has a special interest and a special value for those who care to inquire what ordinary Catholics of the world, well educated in their religion and familiar with the ways of what is called society, have to say on the inner life of Catholics.” It is the purpose of the author to sketch the many and various phases of Catholic life, so as to produce a complete picture of the whole. When the reader has finished the book he will have been introduced to a Catholic home of the educated class.

The work is intended, first for persons outside of the Church who constantly hear of Catholic views, feelings and practices, without being able to understand them, or at best, understanding them only imperfectly. Here they are enabled to get a comprehensive view, and a clearer understanding. It is also intended for converts, who find themselves like strangers in a strange land, and need some one to reach out a friendly hand to them. It is finally intended for Catholics who do not take advantage of the opportunities which they have to learn their religion, and who never appreciate its beauties.

The book deals with many important questions, but attention is specially called to chapters on “Liberal Catholicism,” “Mixed Marriages” and “Catholic and Public Schools.” Particular attention is paid to the Liturgy of the Church, a hundred pages being devoted

to the subject. It is not, however, a systematic or exhaustive treatise on the doctrines and ceremonies of the Church, nor will it take the place of works of that kind.

THE DIVINE PLAN OF THE CHURCH. By the *Rev. John MacLaughlin*, author of "Is One Religion as Good as Another?" 12mo., pp. xxiii.-324. London: Burns & Oates. New York: Benziger Brothers.

The author's former book is well and favorably known. In the present volume he continues the same line of reasoning, and seeks the divine plan of the Church in the mind of its Founder. He argues that such a plan must have existed before the foundation of the Church, and that the organization which possesses the qualities of this Divine Plan must be the original authentic organization. He contends that this Plan can be found in the Divine Mind, and that if it can be proved that the essential form which Christ intended to give to His Church is found in the Roman Catholic Church only, all sincere Christians will enter her fold. He has noticed that the great conflict between opposing parties in the Church of England in recent years is about the externals of religion and not about its essence. Hence he wishes to draw attention away from forms for a time in order to fix it on substance.

The author tells us that he has not aimed at style, because he has written for the multitude. He begins with the key to the building—"Love of truth and belief in the Incarnation." Then follows a chapter to prove that there was a plan, distinct and definite, in the mind of Christ, according to which His Church was to be formed and developed. The next step is to show the antiquity and eternity of that plan, and therefore its absolute inviolability—its exclusion of, and freedom from, all human or even angelic influence. Then we come to the plan itself, and learn what it necessarily contained, and what it necessarily excluded. The next two chapters treat of indefectibility and infallibility with certain corollaries, and the second part of the book is devoted to the Church of England to show that the Divine Plan is not realized in that body.

One may learn from this short sketch of the work that it is a very important one, and that it will accomplish much good.

A SAINT OF THE ORATORY: the Life of Blessed Antony Grassi, of the Fermo Congregation. By *Lady Annabel Kerr*. 12mo., pp. 271. London: Burns & Oates. New York: Benziger Brothers.

It is well for us that sanctity is not confined to any state or condition of life and that we can find in the calendar of saints persons of every condition. King and subject, rich and poor, learned and

ignorant, young and old—all have succeeded in serving God so well as to be worthy to be enrolled on the list of the blessed. Many persons are tempted to think that in order to be saints they must be called to do some extraordinary work, and that they must do it in such a way as to draw the eyes of the world to them. It is true that some of the saints were distinguished in this unusual manner, but it is also true that others attained to the highest sanctity by performing the most ordinary duties well. We have an illustration of this truth in the life of Blessed Antony Grassi, the priest of the Oratory of St. Philip Neri, who has been recently beatified. His biographer says of him: "The life of Blessed Antony Grassi was a wonderful revelation of God, though not, perhaps, in the same sense that the lives of other saints—missionaries, founders or martyrs—are to be called wonderful. His may be called so in a sense almost peculiarly his own. The hiddenness of his life, the absence in it of all excitement, either exterior or interior, or of any event in it, and the sanctification of his soul by what many would be inclined to call narrow and commonplace circumstances give a special stamp to the holiness of the new Beatus.

"There was nothing from beginning to end to make Blessed Antony's eighty years of life remarkable in the ordinary sense of the word, for they were devoid of every element of sensation, heroism or exterior interest. He was born, lived and died in one small Italian town, the immediate radius of which he left on only one occasion. . . . He became a saint by the faithful performance of apparently insignificant duties towards God and man, it being part of his sanctity that he found such duties pleasant."

Such was the gentle, simple, untroubled life of him who at this moment is proposed to our veneration. Certainly an excellent model for this rushing age, when men live in constant turmoil, nor ever pause to ask themselves why or whither.

THEOLOGIA MORALIS DECALOGALIS ET SACRAMENTALIS. Auctore Clarissimo P. Patritio Sporer, Ord. FF. Min. Novis curis edidit P. F. Bierbaum, Ord. FF. Min. Tomus III. Paderbornae MDCCCCL. Ex Typographia Bonifaciana. Price, mk. 9.60; bound, mk. 12.

With the present volume the new edition of Sporer's treatises on the moral theology of the Decalogue and the Sacraments is brought to a conclusion. The two preceding volumes have been previously reviewed in these pages. Nothing need here be added to the recommendation then given. What Lehmkuhl says of the work as a whole is particularly applicable to this latter portion—*opus solide et erudite scriptum*. That Sporer was *aliquando benignior in sententiis* will not be deemed an unpardonable fault by those who without min-

imizing precept seek like the Master to make the yoke sweet and the burden light.

The volume at hand includes the treatises on the Sacraments in general, Orders, the Eucharist, Penance and Matrimony. The editor has added an Appendix *De Libris Prohibitis*. That eleven and a half hundred solidly printed pages should be devoted to these subjects will not be considered too ample an exposition by those who are alive to their importance. At the same time this breadth of treatment indicates that the work appeals primarily to the more advanced student of moral theology. On the other hand, the perfect transparency of the style and the orderly arrangement of the matter adapt it to the attainments of the beginner. Like the works of the great masters generally it reflects the author's science unbroken to every eye accustomed to the light of such subjects, whilst of course it will reveal deeper depths to those whose sight has been longest trained in the moral relations of the soul with God and the nature and laws of His sacramental communications.

"A STORMY LIFE," "TOO STRANGE NOT TO BE TRUE," "MRS. GERALD'S NIECE."
By *Lady Georgiana Fullerton*. Large 8vo., pp. 304, 276 and 178. Philadelphia:
John Joseph MeVey.

Mrs. Fullerton's stories, like good things generally, never lose their flavor. This is more than can be said for most of the modern tales. Her novels have a permanent value, because they have real merit. They not only amuse, but they teach. Most of our modern stories amuse only, and not always in an innocent way. There is much consolation for right minded persons in the thought that the *popular* novel is short lived, and that it has no resurrection. The good novel does not share the mushroom growth of its neighbor, but it blooms for succeeding generations with all the beauty and fragrance of its first growth.

This applies to Mrs. Fullerton's stories with more than usual force, and therefore we welcome their reappearance cordially. Mr. MeVey has brought out new editions of the three books before us in his usual tasteful manner as to paper, type and binding, and at a cost to the purchaser that places them within the reach of all who wish to combine literature with fiction.

SPECIAL INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. By *Rev. Francis E. Gtgot, S. S.*, Professor of Sacred Scripture in St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore, and author of General Introduction to the Study of the Holy Scriptures, etc. Part I., The Historical Books. 8vo., pp. 381. New York: Benziger Brothers.

This is the second volume of the series which the reverend author

is preparing on the "Introduction to the Holy Scriptures." We have had the "General Introduction," now we have the "Special Introduction to the Historical Books of the Old Testament," then will follow "Special Introduction to the Didactic and Prophetical Writings of the Old Testament," and finally the "Special Introduction to the Books of the New Testament." It was originally intended that the work should be in three volumes, but as it progressed the matter became so extensive as to require two volumes for the Old Testament.

All the excellencies of the first volume appear in this one. The concise yet clear treatment, the helpful arrangement, the copious references continue to be the distinguishing features of the work which make it very valuable for students. Indeed, throughout the book the hand of the experienced teacher is apparent.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

- L'EGLISE ET LES ORIGINES DE LA RENAISSANCE. Par *Jean Guiraud*. 12mo., pp. 339. Paris: V. Lecoffre, 1902.
- THE TRIUMPH OF THE CROSS. By *Fra Girolamo Savonarola*. 12mo., pp. xxxi-213. London: Sands & Co., 1901.
- THE LITTLE IMPERFECTIONS. By *Rev. F. P. Garesché, S. J.* 12mo., pp. 251. St. Louis: B. Herder, 1901.
- THE LEGENDS OF GENESIS. By *Hermann Gunkel*. 12mo., pp. 164. Chicago: Open Court Publishing Co., 1901.
- SERMONS ON THE HOLY GHOST. By *A Diocesan Priest*. 12mo., pp. 235. New York: Cathedral Library Association, 1901.
- SAINTE THÉRÈSE. Par *M. Henri Joly*. 2me edition. 12mo., pp. 244. Paris: V. Lecoffre, 1902.
- JUVENILE ROUND TABLE. Stories by the foremost Catholic Writers. 12mo., pp. 216. New York: Benziger Brothers.
- CHATS WITHIN THE FOLD. By *H. J. Desmond*. 16mo., pp. 205. Baltimore: John Murphy Co., 1901.
- HER FATHER'S DAUGHTER. By *Katherine Tynan Hinkson*. 12mo., pp. 160. New York: Benziger Brothers, 1901.
- "BUT THY LOVE AND THY GRACE." By *Francis J. Finn, S. J.* 12mo., pp. 138. New York: Benziger Brothers, 1901.
- A LIFE'S LABYRINTH. By *Mary F. Mannix*. 12mo., pp. 304. The Ave Maria, Notre Dame, 1901.
- FIRST CONFESSION. By *Mother M. Loyola*. 16mo., pp. xxvi-63. New York: Benziger Brothers, 1901.
- "FORGIVE US OUR TRESPASSES." By *Mother M. Loyola*. 16mo., pp. xvi-142. New York: Benziger Brothers, 1901.
- THE RETREAT MANUAL. By *Madame Cecilia*. 16mo., pp. 208. New York: Benziger Brothers, 1901.
- THE CROWN OF THORNS. By *Paul Carus*. 16mo., pp. 74. Chicago: Open Court Publishing Co., 1901.
- THE FEAST OF THALARCHUS. By *Condé Benoist Pallen*. 16mo., pp. 73. Boston: Small, Maynard & Co., 1901.
- THE VICTORIES OF ROME. By *Kenelm Digby Best*, of the Oratory. 16mo., pp. 149. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., Limited, 1901.

70760

DOES NOT CIRCULATE

THIS BOOK MAY NOT BE
TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

PERIODICAL

